

# The QUARTERLY REVIEW

No. 577

JULY 1948

Vol. 286

1. The Credibility of the Gospel.  
By the Very Rev. the Dean of Winchester, D.D.
  2. Some Past and Present Experiences of the Middle Class.  
By Lord Soulbury, O.B.E., M.C.
  3. 'Even Spain.'  
By Arthur F. Loveday, O.B.E.
  4. Democracy Re-examined.  
By R. F. Rattray, Ph.D.
  5. Replacing Lost Merchant Ships.  
By Cuthbert Maughan.
  6. Psychiatry in the Criminal Courts.  
By Leo Page.
  7. Religion and Politics.  
By John de Courcy.
  8. Concerning English Oak and Timber.  
By J. D. U. Ward.
  9. Hungary, Formerly, Yesterday, and To-day.  
By Sir Raymond Beazley, D.Litt.
  10. U.S.A. Presidential Election.  
By John A. Stevenson.
- Some Recent Books.

Distributed Quarterly by

**THE INTERNATIONAL NEWS COMPANY**

*Sole Agents for American Continent*

131 VARICK STREET, NEW YORK

Single Copies, \$1.75

Yearly Subscription, \$6.50

Entered at New York Post Office as Second Class Matter

LONDON: JOHN MURRAY

**TO SUBSCRIBERS**  
**AND AGENCIES**

**THE QUARTERLY REVIEW**

**Subscribers are supplied by the  
INTERNATIONAL NEWS COMPANY**

**131 VARICK STREET,  
NEW YORK CITY,**

**to whom all renewals and inquiries  
regarding this periodical should be  
sent.**

THE  
QUARTERLY  
REVIEW

No. 577.

PUBLISHED IN  
JULY 1948.

LONDON:  
JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.1.

NEW YORK:  
THE INTERNATIONAL NEWS COMPANY.  
1948

*Entered as Second Class matter at the New York, U.S.A., Post Office*

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN

# Where there's need - there's The Salvation Army

**\*Thirty years ago, Bert and Mary Jones quarrelled.** Bert walked out. Soon after, Mary sailed to Australia with their two small sons. When her elder son in R.A.A.F. uniform, bade her goodbye, Mary said, "Perhaps you can find your father when you get to England." Bert's son told this story to The Salvation Army Missing Persons' Bureau. To-day the family is happily reunited. 4,000 such enquiries are received each year and two-thirds are successfully solved.

\*Only the name is fictitious

GENERAL ALBERT ORSBORN, C.B.E., 101, QUEEN VICTORIA ST., LONDON, E.C.4

---

Printed in Great Britain by WILLIAM CLOWES & SONS, Limited, London and Beccles



THE  
QUARTERLY REVIEW

No. 577.—JULY 1948.

Art. 1.—THE CREDIBILITY OF THE GOSPEL.

1. *The Rise of Christianity.* By Ernest William Barnes, Bishop of Birmingham. Longmans, 1947.
2. *The Bible and Modern Scholarship.* By Sir Frederic G. Kenyon, G.B.E., K.C.B., D.Litt. John Murray, 1948.
3. *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums.* By Eduard Meyer. 1924.

I

It is generally agreed that religious belief, if it is to command the credence of reasonable men, must rest, like any other kind of rational belief, upon evidence. Such evidence is of an unusually complex and varied kind in view of the claim of religion to be an interpretation of the whole of life; but evidence it is none the less, and it requires therefore to be scientifically examined and assessed. The primary *data* are both inward and outward—the outward circumstances and events and experiences of life, and the inward feelings of wonder and fear, disgust and need, love and hatred, which make up man's reaction to his lot. The ways in which magic and ritual, custom and myth have expressed these primitive stages of religion have been the subject of patient and sympathetic study by scientific men for generations. The founders of the great historical religions which have most deeply influenced the human race have been at once conservative and radical in relation to this early undergrowth: conservative in that they have lived in close conjunction with those fundamental experiences—birth and marriage and death, prosperity and adversity, and so on—which it expressed; radical in that by their own insight and force of personality they have enlarged the horizons of men's experience and brought new interpretations into being. In particular, the element of

Vol. 286.—No. 577.

morality, already a marked feature of tribal religion, is developed and enriched through the emphasis which these teachers place on individual salvation and their insistence on the unity of God. Over this field, too, the science of Comparative Religion has ranged widely, aided now not only by the evidence of travellers and missionaries, but by a vast wealth of literary evidence—sacred scriptures, poetry, philosophy—and by the manifest links which this reveals with theistic thought throughout the world.

Among these great religions stand Judaism and Christianity; but they stand somewhat apart owing to the peculiar importance which they give to history—that is, to the actual march of events—in their conception of religion. For the Jew of old, the primary subject of religion was that historical entity, the race—a race which was also a nation, a state, and a church; and though its leaders were often men of rare religious genius, and though the piety of the individual Jew was increasingly emphasised as the centuries passed, it was to Israel as a whole that the promises were made, the Law given, and the prophecies addressed; and even when the stage was enlarged to embrace world-history, past, present and to come, it was still Israel which was at the centre of it. The reason for this is the belief attested by the whole Old Testament that God is the living God, Himself in action as Creator and Redeemer on the field of history and particularly in the history of His chosen people, Israel. His Word created the world, and His righteous will shaped its destinies: nations and empires were advanced by Him or rejected—and this came to be held true even of Israel itself—according as they sought to serve the divine purpose or to substitute for it their own selfish ends. Moreover, for most of the immense period covered by the Old Testament, the belief prevailed that the divine purpose of redemption would be finally accomplished within the historical process and on this earth: the hope of a Messiah was in many of its forms a this-worldly hope. Even when the facts of experience proved too stubborn for this belief, the Jews never took refuge in any of the contemporary doctrines of immortality, such as the Orphic or the Platonic, which involved disparagement of the material world as worthless or disbelief in the continual identity of actual persons after death. On the contrary, they envisaged a Last Judgment as the climax

of history and thought of immortality in terms of a Resurrection which would be meta-historical rather than metaphysical, and would guarantee to the righteous at least fulness of life.

Christians believe that the Founder of their religion came as the climax and fulfilment of this earlier faith. By race a Jew, Jesus was nurtured on the Jewish scriptures, worship, and way of life, spoke their idiom, sang their hymns, knew their God as in a peculiar sense His own Father, and went to His death as their Messiah. His contemporaries, even though they sometimes thought that He was beside Himself, also felt that He 'spoke with authority and not as the scribes'—truths fresh from the very fountain-head of Truth itself; and the Sermon on the Mount assures us that some at least recognised in Him one who was greater even than Moses. Moreover He certified His teaching by 'mighty works' or 'signs' which showed that the hand of God was with Him. Whatever may be thought of Christ's miracles—and we shall return to that matter below—it may be taken as certain that Christ Himself appealed to them as evidences of the supernatural authority which He claimed. The summary of the earliest Christian gospel given in Acts x. 34-43—a passage which only becomes grammatical when translated back into the original Aramaic behind it—shows both how deeply grounded it was in the religion of Israel and also what vital significance the primitive Church attached to the historical element, the element of plain fact, within it. Moreover, though Christ is believed to be now risen and ascended and Christians to be a 'new creation' in Him and through His Spirit, the Acts and the Epistles show that this emphasis on the historical never flagged: the facts were commemorated at every act of worship, and the Eucharist especially pointed men's thoughts forward to the culmination of all things when Christ should come as Judge.

The result of Christianity giving this cardinal place to historical facts in its whole conception of religion has been inevitably and rightly to invite the most searching scientific inquiry as to the truth of the facts asserted; and for nearly two centuries the relevant documents have been, to a degree unknown in any other religion, the subjects of such investigation. In the case of the Old Testament, as

Sir Frederic Kenyon points out, archæology has provided the whole Hebrew story 'with a background in our knowledge of the surrounding peoples in Egypt, Babylonia, Assyria, with the Hittites, the Amorites, and the Hurri,' which enables us to read it now in fuller perspective and follow the story more intelligently than was the case fifty years ago. The work of Hebraists, moreover, has enabled us to date the Old Testament documents and their sources and parts with increasing accuracy, and observe the influence of the prophets on their compilation. Further, this process has shown how we can abandon the notion (a relic of medievalism and Protestantism rather than of Christian antiquity) of the inerrancy of Scripture 'not merely without harm to its religious authority, but with a positive reinforcement of it.' To the scientific disciplines involved—those of textual, grammatical, and literary criticism—Jewish and Christian scholars alike have contributed; though where exegesis is involved they have naturally parted company on certain weighty issues.

The same processes have been at work, only with a far greater intensity and wider range, on the New Testament. The scientific weighing of evidence is a matter of the comparison of documents and facts; and since the New Testament was written in Greek and in a form of Greek of which we have countless other examples, documentary study yields an unusually accurate and detailed knowledge. Thus, as Sir Frederic Kenyon says, 'no other ancient book has anything like such early and plentiful testimony to its text'; for parts of it indeed we have evidence dating from the first half of the second century, and perhaps earlier. The importance of this is twofold. In the first place, the discovery of the Chester Beatty papyri in 1931 has 'strengthened very materially the basis—already very strong—of our confidence in the text of the New Testament as it has come down to us'; and attempts to undermine the credibility of the gospel on the ground that the texts of the documents were subject to easy and wilful corruption have become correspondingly vain. Secondly, certain manuscript fragments published in 1935 point so clearly to the circulation of the Fourth Gospel in the first half of the second century as to make it almost certain—Sir Frederic Kenyon, indeed, uses an even stronger term—that the Gospel was written before

A.D. 100. These, moreover, are recent discoveries and clearly they may not be the last. Again, since the days of Erasmus the finest classical scholarship, reinforced in the present century by an ever more plentiful knowledge of Hellenistic idiom and ways of thought, has been devoted to the determination of the meaning which the sacred books had for those who wrote them ; and the story of the ways in which this meaning has been translated into Christian liturgy, hymnody, and prayer and into the thought of successive generations and ages has been under constant and searching review—a task of the utmost necessity, since no theory of Christian origins can be reckoned of value unless it lays bare a cause adequate to account for what proceeded from it. Finally both theologians and historians have brought to bear upon the New Testament the critical spirit and the modern methods of historical inquiry. It is remarkable, for instance, how many eminent historians in this country have become bishops : we need only mention Thirlwall, Creighton, and Stubbs ; and it would be absurd to suppose that these men withheld from the study of Christian origins methods which were almost second nature to them in historical matters. Of Bishop Lightfoot it would be hard to say whether he were the better theologian or historian, for he is plainly in the first rank in either field. In the present century no one, I suppose, has been esteemed more highly as a secular historian than Eduard Meyer ; and when he turns aside from the study of ancient or modern history to that of the beginnings of Christianity, his judgments are of great importance. When he reckons St Luke's work, for example, as having 'the same character as that of the great historians' such as Polybius or Livy, and assigns to him 'an outstanding place amongst those historians who are most significant from the standpoint of world history,' we are listening to the verdict not of any biassed amateur, but of a professional historian who was in religion an agnostic and by race a Jew.

## II

It has seemed desirable to exhibit with some fulness the various kinds of scientific discipline which go to the work of biblical theology, because there is a widespread popular misconception to the effect that the natural sciences

and mathematics are alone in yielding exact and accurate knowledge and that theology is concerned only with vague generalisations or hair-splitting logomachies. Few scholars, of course, can expect to have close first-hand familiarity with more than two or three of these disciplines, though specialisation in this field has probably not gone to the lengths found in science, where—to quote an instance lately brought to my notice—sixty men may be engaged in a laboratory and only a handful know anything of the work on which the others are engaged. But nothing could be more rigid or objective than the rules governing research in most branches of theology; and though in some of its fields—those which deal with the meaning of the sacred text—faith is needed to illuminate the understanding, that is no more than to say, *mutatis mutandis*, that you do not go to the stone-deaf for an appreciation of music nor to the blind for the appreciation of a painting. In a sense, as Bishop Creighton observed, 'Historical criticism is not a science: it is only an investigation of the value of evidence. It rests on presumptions which are derived from experience. I am disposed to believe what is analogous to my experience: my criticism is awakened by what is not analogous.'\* But that does not mean that the historian's methods are not fully scientific, nor that he determines his conclusions *a priori*, nor that we hesitate to assign to his findings such authority as his training in that field of knowledge and his treatment of the evidence entitle them to claim.

It is precisely here that the failure of Dr Barnes' book as a contribution to the subject of Christian origins is to be found. Not only is it *a priorist* from cover to cover; but the author seems unaware of the intellectual processes and disciplines which have been devoted to the subject in the past, and indeed contemptuous of them. Reviewers of the highest distinction and of every school of thought and every denomination have been at one in pointing this out; but none has done so with more force or fulness than Dr Gardner-Smith in the 'Modern Churchman' for July 1947. 'One has a feeling,' he writes, 'that the distinguished author is lacking in the true instinct of the critic or the historian. He has made up his mind what he will

---

\* 'Life and Letters of Mandell Creighton,' I, p. 330 f.

find in his sources, and he finds it; but the selection of evidence is apparent, and many of his judgments are sweeping and arbitrary. With all respect it must be said that Dr Barnes lacks the ability to transfer himself into another age and to enter into the minds of men whose background was so different from his own.' Nor has he the learning which enables a man to distinguish between novel theories which have been or are likely to be fruitful and those which are merely 'freaks.' Some readers of this article may remember the stir caused at Cambridge about forty years ago by the supposed discovery by a young research student of the origin of life: it was a year or two's wonder. But it passed, as the wiser heads said it would: either the bouillon had not been wholly sterilised, or the living organisms were not really alive—I forget which it was; but at any rate it passed. Similarly and at about the same time, the Baconian theory of the authorship of Shakespeare's Works was much canvassed. That had a much longer run, and has indeed begotten other theories attached to other names than Bacon's. Yet a thorough and scholarly work like Quincy Adams' 'Life of Shakespeare' (1932) finds it quite unnecessary even to allude to these notions; and a still more recent American study only alludes to them in order to dismiss them. Dr Barnes' treatment of the New Testament is riddled with what one may call 'Baconian' fantasy; and readers will do well to be aware of it.

If we ask the nature of the prejudices which dictate Dr Barnes' *a priori* methods, the answer is not difficult: he objects to miracles and he objects to sacraments—the former as intellectually incredible and the latter as superstitious. We will consider them in order.

Miracles must be discarded on the ground of what the author calls the 'dogma' of the (large-scale) uniformity of nature. To speak of a 'dogma' in this way is to do grave disservice to the principle of regularity in the operations of nature which theology no less than the natural sciences demands. One eminent scientist of my acquaintance, when asked if he believed this 'dogma,' exclaimed, 'Ridiculous: it is simply a summary of statistical probability.' Another said that he could not see how miracles could be pronounced impossible by anyone who believed in answers to prayer, and that he personally believed in both.



Indeed Dr Barnes himself was evidently of the same mind when in January 1918 he published a sermon in the 'Guardian' in which he defended miracles in general, and the Virgin Birth in particular, in connection with the unique event of the Incarnation; and it would be interesting to know when and by whom and on what grounds the 'dogma' has been laid down in the interval. The fact is that no man can know enough of nature to dogmatise about it in this way, for it is dogmatising on the merest fragment of the facts. St Augustine's definition of miracle as *non contra naturam sed contra quam est nota natura* was never more apposite than to-day, when the scale of the physical universe has been so vastly enlarged by modern science, and the abstract character of our knowledge of it is so strongly emphasised. Even Dr Barnes' limitation of the 'dogma' to nature's 'large-scale' operations represents a diminution of claims made for uniformity half a century ago; and there are scientists and philosophers to-day who would reduce them still further.

When all is said and done, is there much fault to be found with what that acute thinker, the late Lord Balfour, wrote on the matter? \* Dismissing the idea that miracles are intrinsically incredible and that every narrative which contains a taint of the miraculous must therefore be purified or rejected, as 'very loose talk,' he says that 'Common-sense looks doubtfully upon anything out of the common; and science follows suit.' So, we may add, does theology. What experience presents us with is a rule not of uniformity but of normality. Christian theology here fights on two fronts; it opposes the indeterminist no less than the dogmatist for uniformity. This is because Christians believe that God is a God of order and is to be relied on in His operations both in nature and in history. The faith expressed in Psalm 119 is an integral part of the Christian religion:

O Lord, thy word: endureth for ever in heaven.

Thy truth also remaineth from one generation to another: thou has laid the foundation of the earth, and it abideth.

They continue this day according to thine ordinance: for all things serve thee.

---

\* 'Science, Religion and Reality.' The Sheldon Press, 1928. Introduction.



Incidentally, except against such a background there could be no miracles.

Moreover, it is against such a background that Christ Himself set His miracles : He postulates the regularities of this world-order in claiming that it has been invaded by the powers of another, and His mighty works are the sign and certificate of that invasion. 'Go and shew John again those things which ye do hear and see,' and there follows a brief catalogue of His miracles, ending with 'and the poor have the gospel preached to them,' which was the greatest miracle of all (Matt. xi. 4-6 ; cf. also xi. 20-24). 'If I with the finger of God cast out devils, no doubt the kingdom of God is come upon you' (Luke xi. 20). And, still more significantly, when He was challenged by the Jews for absolving a paralysed man from his sins, He met the challenge by giving them at once a visible sign which they could not gainsay : 'that ye may know that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins, (he said to the sick of the palsy,) I say unto thee, Arise, and take up thy bed, and go thy way into thine house' (Mark ii. 1-12). No wonder they were all amazed and glorified God and said, 'We never saw it on this fashion !' The truth is that no sense at all can be made of the Synoptic Gospels, least of all of the earliest, St. Mark, if the stories of miracle are removed from them ; for miracle and teaching are so closely intertwined that the result is simply a mutilated and incoherent document. That is not to say that the miracles present no difficulties : in many cases a modern eye-witness might have described them differently ; in some cases a parabolic saying may have been transmuted into a miraculous act. But when sober criticism has said its say, the Gospels bear irrefragable evidence to the repeated occurrence of incidents in our Lord's ministry, and as part and parcel of His ministry and teaching, which did arouse, and would to-day arouse, a profound *wonder* in the on-lookers—a wonder which is always an indispensable condition of any deep religious faith, and did in fact lead many of Christ's contemporaries to accept Him as their divine Lord and Saviour. It is in that context that the Church affirms in the Creeds its belief in the Virgin Birth and the Resurrection.

Perhaps the best example of Dr Barnes' methods is his treatment of 1 Corinthians, for it shows the lengths to

which his antipathy to sacraments as well as to miracles will go. This Epistle is an awkward one from his point of view ; for on the accepted view as to its date—A.D. 55 or 56—it gives us our earliest documentary evidence for the Resurrection and for the institution of the Eucharist. Its integrity, moreover, is not seriously disputed by biblical scholars, whether conservative or liberal, though a few glosses here and there may have crept into the text from the margin. But this will not do at all for our author. In his view, as Sir Frederic Kenyon puts it, the Epistle is ‘an amalgam of leaflets and portions of letters’ ; in particular the narrative of the Last Supper is ‘a tract written late in the first century and attached with alterations to the Corinthian letter ; and the passage on the Resurrection is one of the many tracts or fly-sheets written one or two generations after him.’ Even the prose-poem on Charity in 1 Cor. xiii is not allowed to pass, as being too good to have been written by St Paul ; though what becomes, on that showing, of the ‘more excellent way’ which the Apostle has promised in xii. 31 to unfold, one cannot surmise.

Such treatment of documents not only violates every canon of scientific criticism ; it is also foolish, because it is quite unnecessary even from Dr Barnes’ point of view. The history of religious movements lends no colour whatever to the view that a generation or more must elapse before miraculous narratives can arise. The Sadhu Sundar Singh was still alive when the late Canon Streeter recorded the Sadhu’s testimony to the miracles which had attended his ministry ; \* and countless other examples could be given. What the patient and reverent student of such narratives will do is to try to understand—so far as they do not baffle understanding—what occurred, and to give his own version of the incidents in terms which will not rob the original records of all meaning. Thus, in regard to the Resurrection, the usual Modernist treatment of the narratives is to accept their testimony to the risen Lord’s appearances ; but to regard the evidence for the empty tomb as secondary and unreliable. But Dr Barnes will have none of it : there was no empty tomb, because there

---

\* ‘The Sadhu.’ By B. H. Streeter and A. J. Appasamy. Macmillan, 1921.

was probably no tomb, and there were no appearances, because——? Well, that is not easy to answer. Perhaps it is because Dr Barnes thinks that belief in visions of any kind would involve an unworthy concession to the supernatural. But I confess to thinking that the reason lies deeper. For I cannot find any convincing evidence in his book that he believes that Christ rose from the dead at all. For the disciples' belief that He did he substitutes a subjective conviction on their part 'that the Spirit of the Lord Jesus was with them,' from which they inferred—whether rightly or wrongly he does not say—that 'He must obviously be alive.' The theory which appears best to account for what Dr Barnes has written in his book is that Jesus did not *personally* survive death at all; that His personality was absorbed into the universal Spirit; and that what survived, or rather what emerged into the consciousness of the disciples, was this Spirit. There is no Easter message left, but only that of Whit-Sunday. Needless to say, that is not the belief of Christianity.

In the case of the Eucharist different prejudices are operating. They are those which have led him, in the administration of his diocese, to obstruct and sometimes persecute clergy who appeared to be violating rubrics in a Catholic direction, while encouraging and even promoting men who transgressed them in directions of which he personally approves. It will not do, therefore, to have sacramental doctrine of the plain Pauline and Anglican kind being taught in the Church as early as the sixth decade of the first century, within thirty years of the Crucifixion. 1 Corinthians xi must therefore be got rid of, and time allowed for the corrupting influence of the Hellenistic Mystery Religions to do its deadly work. Not a word here of the eschatological, and therefore Hebraic, framework in which St Paul sets the Eucharist and which it has retained ever since; not a word as to the extent to which the sacramental as well as the sacrificial was already implicit in Jewish ordinances; indeed it is 'highly improbable' that Jews ever gave to the Eucharist any such sacrificial significance as is involved in the words 'This is my body,' 'This is my blood.' And naturally to an author holding such views 1 Cor. xi. 20 ff. is a very awkward passage, if it were written by St Paul. All the more refreshing is it to turn from this kind of *a priori* argumentation

to the verdict of a genuine historian like Eduard Meyer. This is what he writes :

'The tradition connected with it (sc. the Eucharist) was part of the oldest tradition of the Gospel, as Paul had received it at Damascus. . . . Paul received the tradition of the establishment of the Holy Supper in the same sense "from the Lord" as He did the whole Gospel (Gal. i. 11 ff.). That really means that he owes it to the Lord's immediate action that he became a Christian. His initiation, in fact, derives from his three-years apprenticeship at Damascus, supplemented by his intercourse with Peter and James in Jerusalem (Gal. i. 18 ff.). There can be no question of a separate tradition, differing from the generally accepted one, on the Lord's Supper. . . . Paul tells his story very briefly, with several ellipses, by which he is making it plainer still that he presupposes a firmly established tradition. It fits in with this that Mark often verbally agrees with him. . . . The formula with regard to the wine is slightly modified in Mark ; and in speaking of the bread, he omits the subsequent words "which is given for you," which help to explain the otherwise almost incomprehensible meaning of the formula—but the Christian community for which Mark is writing knew what was meant by it. Likewise the command to celebrate the meal of remembrance has been omitted as unnecessary for a community which always followed this custom. . . .'\*

The passage is a good example of how a genuine historian tackles the problem, handling his documents with complete freedom but always remembering that he is dealing with real people playing a part in real life.

It has not been the purpose of this article to discuss the ethical and ecclesiastical problems arising out of this book. They have already been partly dealt with by the Archbishop of Canterbury ; and it is not to be supposed that the Church, which has recently passed Measures for the better discipline of the inferior clergy, will permanently allow to bishops the legal privilege of discrediting the Scriptures out of which they have promised to instruct their people, advancing erroneous and strange doctrine contrary to God's Word, and denying the Gospel they have been commissioned to preach. It needs, however, to be said

---

\* *Op. cit.* I, pp. 174-76.

that this is no ordinary question of the ethics of conformity.\* There is no question, that is to say, of restraining the legitimate freedom of theological inquiry, nor of using authority to secure uniformity by a process of coercion. Suggestions have been made in the Press that Dr Barnes' case is analogous to those of the writers of 'Essays and Reviews,' of Dr Rashdall, or of Canon Streeter. But the cases are not parallel. All these men accepted to the full the intellectual disciplines proper to their subjects—in the case of 'Essays and Reviews' at a time when such disciplines were unfortunately suspect in the Church; Dr Rashdall, in his Bampton Lectures of 1915, wrote one of the most massive studies of the doctrine of the Atonement which Anglican theology has produced; Canon Streeter, though he was unorthodox about the Virgin Birth and the Empty Tomb, had a lively faith in the Incarnation and the Resurrection. It cannot be too often emphasised that one of the freedoms which the theologian must claim is the right to be sometimes wrong. But none of these men claimed to set up a new religion or preach a different Gospel from that contained in the Scriptures and the Book of Common Prayer. The charge against the Bishop of Birmingham is that he has done this, and done it not as a theologian but as a bishop. As a veteran Free Church minister, reckoned by his colleagues to be somewhat of a Modernist, said to the present writer: 'If that book is true, then there is nothing left.' I have no doubt that that verdict holds.

E. G. SELWYN.

---

\* Those who are interested in that matter may well turn to the admirable discussion of it in Dr Prestige's 'The Life of Charles Gore,' where the friendship formed between Gore and Henry Sidgwick makes a charming part of the story.

## Art. 2.—SOME PAST AND PRESENT EXPERIENCES OF THE MIDDLE CLASS.

‘It should never be forgotten that the one decisive factor in the rise of totalitarianism on the Continent—which is yet absent in this country—is the existence of a large, recently dispossessed middle class.’

Professor Hayek—‘The Road to Serfdom.’

THE twentieth century has not been kind to the middle class. Physically destroyed in Russia, ruined in Germany by inflation—a terrific weight of taxation threatens to eliminate it from Britain. In our country to-day a rich man with substantial liquid resources can still maintain something like his pre-war position and meet the demands of the Inland Revenue by periodic sales of his capital—a good many wealthy people must have been doing this for some years, and the recent budget will, of course, sharply stimulate this practice. For example, a man aged fifty with an invested fund of say 250,000*l.* yielding a gross income of 10,000*l.* per annum retains after paying income tax and surtax little more than 3,000*l.* per annum. Such a sum is no doubt entirely inadequate to enable him to discharge the commitments and preserve the scale of living which his fortune had justified before the war. But assuming a further expectation of life of twenty or twenty-five years he can by the annual realisation of a portion of his assets, supplemented by occasional capital profits or by the sale of pictures, jewellery or furniture, prolong his pre-war rate of expenditure without any very drastic alteration of his establishment. He can also, by a judicious timing of gifts *inter vivos*, soften the impact of death duties and make some provision for his heirs. The ‘capital levy on investments,’ unless it becomes recurrent, will not gravely embarrass such a man, particularly if he has been shrewd enough during the last few years to keep large sums in cash or sell some part of his Government or other securities and apply the proceeds to the purchase of diamonds, furs, or similar valuables.

It is quite otherwise with the moderately well-to-do and the small capitalists, and, generally speaking, it is they who form the bulk of what is called the middle class, though of course this class shades off by almost imperceptible

degrees into upper and lower levels. But I have particularly in mind the small manufacturer or business man hoping to develop and hand his undertaking on to his family; the professional man who must save in order to secure for his children the prolonged education and apprenticeship necessary to enable them to follow their father's profession and make suitable provision for himself when his earning power declines. There is also the small landowner, and in many cases the civil servant or the teacher, compulsorily retired at sixty or sixty-five and anxious in the ten or fifteen years that remain to lead a life somewhat more comfortable than his pension will permit and to provide for his widow and dependants. All these people, and especially those who have already retired, are finding it a desperate struggle scrupulously to pay the taxes due from them and at the same time to maintain a remnant of the standard and way of life which in the past had differentiated them socially and economically from the factory or manual worker on a weekly wage. For I doubt whether in the long run it is good for any community that all its members should be content to end their days as tenants of a county council.

But many of the so-called working-class, with far smaller commitments and—being buttressed against sickness and old age by not inconsiderable State subventions—with less stimulus to save and a less firmly established habit of saving, are relatively lightly handled by the tax gatherer. Indeed, in order to escape such charges as are laid upon them, it has apparently been possible for some deliberately to reduce the amount or period of their work and thereby their chargeable earnings without materially diminishing their standard of life. It may not be possible to specify with any precision the principal sources of inflationary expenditure, but the immense increase of purchasing power in the hands of the masses may very well be making a much greater contribution to inflation than can be due to the expenditure of the middle class.

The extinction of its members—the bourgeoisie—as the main originators and exponents of capitalism, has been and is the deliberate policy of the Russian Government. Inflation in Germany between the two wars, though not conceived for that purpose, produced the same effect. The British Government is pursuing a similar course by the



instrument of taxation, but whether of set design or not it is difficult to say. The concessions made to the middle class in the last budget are too small and limited in extent to affect their general position, or to offset the capital losses which many of them must have suffered from falls in the value of Government securities; and, of course, the 'soaking of the rich' is bound to lead eventually to a higher level of taxation on smaller incomes. But to consign this class to the category of those who do not matter a 'tinker's cuss' is to take small account of its political and social importance, though judging by numbers alone it is true that it does not and cannot exercise the same influence at the polls as the industrial voters. Yet from the broader aspect of national well-being the depression of the middle class may prove to be a grave misfortune. 'There is an evil,' says Aristotle, 'in reducing a number of people from affluence to poverty, as they are almost certain to display a revolutionary temper.'

There was a time when both here and abroad the middle class was held to be the backbone of a nation, the principal stabilising factor in the body politic. It constituted 'the wealth and intelligence of the country—the glory of the British name,' as Lord Brougham said a century ago, and it must be admitted that in the nineteenth century the solid middle-class virtues—independence, temperance, thrift, honesty, and industry—made no small contribution to the prosperity and greatness of Britain. Perhaps these qualities are now held in less esteem or are less needful, or have they become so widely spread as to be the qualities of the great majority of the people and not the particular contribution of a section? In view of the daily record of offences against honesty and the colossal expenditure on football pools and other forms of gambling an affirmative answer to that question might be somewhat optimistic.

I am, however, inclined to think that the present and growing disregard of the middle class is the consequence of an ideological change, for, as Bertrand Russell says, philosophy since Descartes or, at any rate, since Locke, tended to embody the prejudices of the commercial middle class while Marxism and Fascism are philosophies appropriate to the modern industrial State, just as Greek philosophy down to Aristotle expressed the mentality appropriate to the Greek City State.



Though many centuries have passed since Aristotle and the City States of Greece have vanished long ago, there is little evidence to justify us in thinking that the vast material changes that have since occurred have been accompanied by any fundamental change in the nature of man. But the immense and complex apparatus of modern civilisation—'the heavy and the weary weight of all this unintelligible world'—makes it increasingly difficult to separate the relevant from the irrelevant, the necessary from the superfluous, or to foretell the response and reaction to social disturbance. Who nowadays can 'see life steadily and see it whole'?

Yet the citizens of the Greek City State were called upon to solve much the same basic problems as ours.

Looking back at Greece over a distance of more than 2,000 years we can see many of our own perplexities in outline. We can study as it were the anatomy of society when the tempo of change was comparatively slow, we can look at it as in a slow-motion picture, the retarding of the pace enables us to analyse the movement and the absence of detail throws into stronger relief the things that matter. Above all we have at our disposal the experiences of an exceptionally clever people recorded and interpreted by historians and philosophers whose brilliant intellects have never been surpassed.

Moreover, the nineteenth-century belief that change is progress must clearly be re-examined in the light of nearly five decades of the twentieth, for as H. A. L. Fisher says, 'the ground gained by one generation may be lost by the next. The thoughts of many may flow into channels which lead to disaster and barbarism.'

So 'back to Aristotle' is not of necessity an outmoded or reactionary counsel. He is entitled to at least as much respect as Marx or Lenin or Professor Laski—

*' . . . il maestro di color che sanno*

*Tutti lo miran, tutti onor gli fanno.'*

Aristotle has much to say regarding the middle class—he defines it as the 'moderately well-to-do—the class intermediate between the rich and the poor'; very broadly speaking this is the class to which I refer as the 'small capitalists.'

We are most of us familiar with the Aristotelian

doctrine of the 'mean' based on the Greek principle of the 'nothing too much' (the corollary is the 'nothing too little'), an idea of fundamental importance in Greek ethics. Aristotle's philosophy of a happy life is a life unimpeded in the exercise of good conduct, and good conduct is a mean between two extremes, e.g., as courage is a mean between cowardice and foolhardiness. Transferring this doctrine from ethics to politics he holds that 'a State composed largely of the middle class enjoys the best political constitution' and he declares that 'the best political association is the one which is controlled by the middle class and that the States capable of a good administration are those in which the middle class is numerically larger and stronger if not than both the other classes—the rich and the poor—yet at least than either of them, and in that case the addition of its weight turns the scale and prevents the predominance of one extreme or the other.' This observation should be of interest to politicians concerned with the problem of what is known as the 'floating vote' at a General Election, supposed, and perhaps rightly, to consist largely of middle-class electors, of people who, though independent of normal party ties may become a decisive factor when stimulated to political action in defence of their standard and way of life. I think that Aristotle gives good advice to party managers when he says that 'the legislator should always aim to secure the support of the middle class.'

But he recommends this support on much broader and more national grounds for, as he says, 'when the middle class is large there is the least danger of disturbances or dissensions amongst citizens.'

Unhappily the class of moderately well-to-do men in ancient Greece was very small—there was little development of the professions and trade and commerce was mainly in the hands of resident aliens. So there was no large body of citizens intermediate between the rich and the poor and for that very reason outbreaks of class warfare in the Greek City States were frequent and fierce. Nothing can have exceeded the bitterness of the faction fight in Coreyra in the fifth century B.C. at the beginning of the Peloponnesian War, so graphically described by a great historian—except perhaps the internecine conflicts in Greece at the present day. 'The leaders on either side

in Corcyra,' says Thucydides, 'used specious names, the one party professing to uphold the constitutional equality of the many, the other the wisdom of an aristocracy' (the same technique is applied to-day in the specious use of the term 'democracy'). 'Striving in every way to overcome each other they committed the most monstrous crimes. . . . The cause of all these evils was the love of power originating in avarice and ambition and the party spirit which is engendered in them.'

Aristotle thought that a numerous and influential middle class was the best defence against disasters of this sort to which the Greek City State was peculiarly prone, disasters arising from class jealousy and discord, and bad relations between rich and poor. He was right, but the tragedy of the Peloponnesian War smashed what there was of a middle class and made it impossible to rebuild it in the Greek City States.

Aristotle had another reason for strengthening this class, a reason which should appeal to us to-day. In Greece as elsewhere its weakness or absence gave the tyrant, the dictator, his opportunity. Time and again some ambitious demagogue took advantage of a party conflict to come forward as the champion of the masses against the upper class, established himself as an autocrat and proceeded to behave in the usual manner of autocrats throughout history. Much the same thing happened in the Italian Republics of the Middle Ages and we have had in our time the examples of Lenin and his successors and Hitler. But neither in the City States of Greece nor in the Italian Republics, nor in Germany, nor in Russia, would such persons have had the same prospect of success had attention been paid to Aristotle's views on the importance of the middle class. Let us hope that his political wisdom will not be disregarded in Britain.

So much for Greece—and the same conclusion can be derived from the Roman Empire. Professor Rostovtzeff in his monumental exposition of the social and economic history of Rome gives as one of the reasons for the decay of the ancient world 'the ruin of the middle class.' It is clear that the fourth and fifth centuries A.D.—the period that immediately preceded the fall of Rome—brought to her middle class many of the misfortunes that have befallen that class during the twentieth century.

The chief cause was taxation. The middle class in the provinces of the late Roman Empire was mainly composed of members of the local Senates and City Councils—the *Curiae*; they were known as '*Curiales*' and were usually owners of small farms in the neighbourhood of their City. These people were grouped by law into a distinct order, comprising citizens eligible for public office, and upon them was placed the main responsibility for meeting the cost of Civil and Imperial administration. This method of defraying public expenditure was inherited and adapted from earlier practices of the Greek City States where the richer citizens were expected, by the performance of voluntary services or '*liturgies*,' to relieve the Exchequer of the burden of various charges such as the provision of choruses for the great dramatic festivals, public banquets, and embassies; even the equipment and maintenance of warships. For these and similar services the State relied upon the patriotism, the ambition, the ostentation of the wealthier section of its inhabitants. But the terrific expenditure and the losses of the Peloponnesian War, at the end of the fifth century B.C., undermined both the willingness and the ability to furnish such contributions. In due course the governments of the City States caused lists to be drawn up of well-to-do people who were required to advance the revenue and were left to recover their contributions from others as best they could.

In Britain the effect of the Second World War upon the ability of philanthropic persons to support the hospitals by voluntary contributions provides some analogy to this consequence of the Peloponnesian War, but the nearest and perhaps the only existing parallel to the '*liturgy*' is the outlay still expected from the High Sheriff of a County or the Lord Mayor of London.

These pernicious methods of Greek finance were perpetuated by Rome in her provinces with disastrous results. The impositions became so costly and oppressive that members of the Curial Order made every possible attempt to escape from it. They abandoned their homes; they joined the Army; they entered the ranks of the clergy; or they took service under some wealthy landowner (the '*clarissimi*' or Imperial nobility were, like the soldiers and clerics, exempt). Every conceivable expedient was adopted to avoid the crushing incubus of the statutory obligations.

But the imperial bureaucrats gradually closed all avenues of escape ; membership of the Curial Order was made hereditary, and finally responsibility was attached to the estate instead of to the individual and his property was not allowed to be alienated without permission of higher authority.

A more deplorable system of financing public expenditure cannot be imagined. That it destroyed local government is not surprising—our municipal elections would not attract much interest or competition under such a regime—and, of course, it destroyed the middle-class provincials in the Empire as surely as if they had been liquidated by a decree of the Kremlin.

It is interesting to note that in Russia a system of collective responsibility for taxation imposed on the peasants was abolished by the Tsar in 1903 and re-instituted by the Bolsheviks in 1919.

The Roman Empire in the West was unable to survive the destruction of its middle class and succumbed to external aggression ; it is one of the little ironies of history that the name of Odovacar—the barbarian leader who took over the Government of Rome in A.D. 476—signified ' Guardian of Property.'

There is no evidence whatever that the middle class was ruined by design, in fact a few years before the debacle the Emperor of Rome described the Curiales as the ' sinews of the state,' admitted that they were ' wearied out by the exaction of diverse and manifold taxes,' and belatedly guaranteed redress. The emperors had no ideological dislike of the bourgeoisie—and there was no Marxian dialectic to prompt their policy. But they needed money and ever more money to satisfy the increasing demands of a vast bureaucracy and the requirements of national defence. The simplest way of raising revenue was from the municipalities—they also needed funds for their own administration—and rendering the councils and their members personally liable for the imperial and civil taxes appeared to be the easiest way of collecting them. To make matters worse, inflation under the later Roman emperors rose to such a pitch that they refused to accept the payment of taxes in currency and demanded payment in kind.

But whether the oppression of a class is due to deliberate

policy or miscalculation makes little difference in the long run to the oppressed, and it is just as feasible, though it takes longer and is less cruel, to ruin a social class by ill-conceived and inequitable finance as by deportation and execution. History seems to show that in either case the happiness, prosperity, stability, and safety of a nation suffer.

If we are to profit from the experience of the past we should consider whether we are in effect making the same mistake as was made by the City States of Greece and the emperors of Rome. In their case the lack of a substantial body of citizens intermediate between the upper and lower strata and the juxtaposition of the two extremes fanned social jealousy and civil strife, which either bred dictatorships and totalitarian government or exposed the afflicted States to foreign conquest.

It is not sufficient to comfort ourselves by the reflection that such things cannot happen to us. They have happened to others long ago and they are happening now before our eyes in other parts of the world. The best safeguard is to stimulate and augment the size of the middle section of the community and to foster the class of 'small capitalists,' a class that experience has shown to be the soundest and most stable element in society.

It is a profound error to suppose that the working man (unless he be a communist) is antagonistic to the bourgeoisie; on the contrary it is usually his ambition that either he or his children should enter its ranks. Every encouragement should be given to him to realise this ambition and become a member of a property-owning democracy. It was a true observation of Bernard Shaw that 'the working man respects the bourgeoisie and wants to be a bourgeois,' and he knows very well that a classless society, even if desirable, is, to quote Bertrand Russell, 'a distant ideal like the Second Coming.'

But our rulers must not defeat his aspirations by allowing fiscal policy to strangle the class to which he aspires to belong. Unhappily that is what they are now doing—perhaps unwittingly; and if it is urged that the Treasury is trying to help by advancing funds to little manufacturers in distressed areas, or that the Government has sponsored industrial and commercial Corporations to make loans to small industrialists, the reply must be that

under the present conditions such inducements are both wasteful and futile.

For with the prevailing system of taxation, particularly as it affects concerns owned by a few friends or the members of a family, the recipients of State advances cannot hope to retain enough of the profit to plough anything back into their undertakings, they cannot provide for expansion and much less can they hope to repay what they have borrowed.

It is a truism to repeat that most of our great industrial organisations have been created from very small beginnings by small capitalists. It was possible for them by intense energy, by thrift and self-denial under an equitable and judicious system of taxation, to re-invest their profits in their business and build up the vast concerns of which the nation is now justifiably proud, and by which it has immensely profited.

But to-day few, if any, small capitalists have the chance of achieving similar success. However industrious and thrifty they may be, taxation—provided of course that they do not practise any dishonest evasions—leaves them but a pittance: they cannot possibly retain a sufficient surplus from which to improve or expand their plant and machinery or build up their stocks. On the other hand there is no reason whatever to suppose that a substitute for their enterprise can be found or their places adequately filled by salaried employees of the State.

To-day we have got into something like the same position as the Roman Empire. The Government needs money and ever more money for the same reasons as the emperors, and has to defray other commitments incomparably heavier, e.g. the social services and the public debt. The money must be found by taxation but there is this obvious difference between taxation in ancient and modern times; the emperors employed it to meet budgetary needs and not as an instrument of social policy. To-day one of the main purposes of taxation appears to be the equalisation of incomes. Noticeable disparities are held to be anti-social. There is, of course, something to be said for this view, for it must be admitted that discrepancies in income often give rise to feelings of envy and jealousy, particularly if the owner of the larger income is thought to be more lucky than industrious. Whether these feelings are justified is another matter, for it is by



no means easy to demonstrate that such disparities, at any rate in a strictly rationed community, do any appreciable social or economic harm ; indeed, to recall the words of the late President of Columbia University, Dr Nicholas Murray Butler, attempts to iron them out may simply 'wreck the world's efficiency for the purpose of redistributing the world's discontent.' Yet there is certainly some truth in the Eastern saying : 'None of us is unhappy when we are all unhappy together.' The late Lord Stamp put it in another way when he asked 'whether it is better for human welfare to have a low standard without envy or a higher one with envy.' The majority opinion to-day seems to be in favour of the low standard and the Government has adopted that view, but as I have already indicated, the fiscal measures contrived to give effect to it may have grave repercussions. For as things are, if the class of the 'small capitalist,' the 'intermediate class,' is to disappear, which seems likely, the situation deprecated by Aristotle will emerge, the 'mean' will fade out and the extremes will confront each other.

Communism is not a reliable corrective for, as Mr Attlee has told us, even in Russia the gap between the lowest and the highest income is constantly widening. Nor will there be time enough, even if there is the desire, to build up another class to take the place of the 'dispossessed,' for many years will be required to cultivate their habits and methods, their way of life and character. So, in the meantime, the stage will be set for all the internal and external stresses that have so greatly embarrassed almost every State that has lost its middle class. A halt should therefore be called to hasty and ill-conceived plans for the greater equality of incomes. These measures are falling with undue severity on many who can ill afford to bear the strain. It would be wiser to endure the continuance of some envy and jealousy and more profitable to forego some revenue than to prolong a rigid and unimaginative policy of levelling until it ends in social upheaval.

Let us hope that before it is too late our rulers will amend their programme and by a drastic reform of the incidence of taxation stimulate the growth and prosperity of the small capitalist. The present scale of taxation is so severe that his virtual extinction cannot be long delayed and our Government, like the German, will be left to deal



with the bitterness of 'a large recently dispossessed middle class.'

We have already observed the consequence of its disappearance from other countries and at other times and we have the profoundest of all political thinkers and the fate of a once great Empire to warn us. If we disregard the wisdom and experience of the past we may well pay a heavy price for our own experience in the future.

'What is the price of experience, do men buy it for a song or wisdom for a dance in the street?—No, it is bought with the price of all that a man hath—his house, his wife, and his children.'

SOULBURY.

## Art. 3.—'EVEN SPAIN.'

A NEWSPAPER report \* of a speech by President Truman quoted him as saying that 'any nation could participate in the Marshall Plan, even Spain.' It is to be hoped and it is likely that that cruel phrase marks the climax or turning point in the twelve-year campaign of injustice and calumny in which statesmen, politicians, the press, the news agencies, the B.B.C., and the intelligentsia have, at times ignorantly and at times maliciously, taken part.

But a great change is taking place in opinion in this country and the U.S.A., an opinion forced upon unwilling statesmen and nations by the Russian tyrant previously admired and praised. They are now ready to accept the realities and lessons learnt from the experiences of the countries absorbed by communism, lessons which an accurate knowledge of the history of Spain and Portugal could have taught them ten years ago. By the time that this article is read it may even be popular to admire and praise Spain and her government instead of abusing them.

People's memories are short and there is much to read and it will therefore be profitable to recall a few facts as to the origin of the present regime in Spain, which has been illogically ostracised to-day by the same nations and governments which had already officially recognised it as the 'de jure' and 'de facto' government of Spain.

First of all it should be remembered that, whatever its failings, the Franco regime is first and last anti-communist, that it came into power as the result of a bloody conflict and civil war between exactly the same elements of Christian western civilisation and Asiatic atheist barbarism which are face to face to-day throughout the world, and that it achieved a victory for the former. Spain has endeavoured as a result of her experience to insulate herself against communism, as have also Portugal and Switzerland, but there are still communist and anarchist elements to whom every word or deed of foreigners against the regime that smashed them in 1939 is a help and encouragement. It is illogical and dangerous for those on the side of Western civilisation to do this now, when for their own survival they require every friend and ally that

---

\* 'Daily Telegraph,' Dec. 20, 1947.

they can find and when Spain, Portugal, and their Latin American descendants are their natural allies.

If only the world had been given a true instead of a false history of Spain in the years 1925-39 and of the civil war, it would have had a blue print of what would happen or has happened in Poland, Yugoslavia, Hungary, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, and what may still happen in other countries. Careful and intelligent penetration by communism directed from Moscow into the labour and intellectual organisations in the fertile soil of Spain brought about strikes and sabotage, then the fall of the Monarchy, then a popular front government, and lastly the civil war and the terror, all in accordance with published communist theory and planning. Though public opinion has been continually and intentionally befogged by able propaganda, this can no longer be hid or denied. As contemporary evidence may carry more weight than a bald statement of fact, the following extracts from the files of the 'Morning Post' of despatches from that paper's correspondent (the present writer), who was resident in Spain throughout those years, are quoted :

June 30, 1930. 'Communist professional agitators, who recently engineered strikes in Andalucia, are trying to foment strikes in Barcelona.'

Nov. 10, 1930. 'The general strike continues here. . . . There is no doubt that the strike here and in Madrid is brought about by the communist Sindicato Unico.'

Jan. 31, 1932. 'A revolutionary movement has broken out over the whole district lying between the Pyrenees and Barcelona. A communist Republic has been proclaimed by the revolutionaries in the towns to the north of Barcelona.'

March 31, 1932. 'Complicating the already confused situation and continually disturbing labour and industry are a network of organisations professing creeds with different names and apparently in conflict with each other . . . all employ the same weapons of the strike, picketing, terrorism, pistolmen and use a common vocabulary . . . the above organisations radiate like the spokes of a wheel from Moscow, which is the hub.'

(The organisations were anarchist, communist, trotskyst, and socialist.)

Jan. 3, 1933. 'An attempt to burn the aerodrome of Barcelona was discovered yesterday. . . The police search . . .

revealed an extensive plot to bring about an anarchist revolution.'

March 13, 1934. 'At any moment the world may witness the conflict taking place between Marxism and Christianity take on a new and perhaps a very violent phase.'

(In October in that year there took place an attempt to set up a Soviet in Asturias, which was suppressed after much loss of life and property.)

In 1936 an article in the 'Morning Post' stated: 'The Spanish struggle is a war between two religions, the religion of Christ and the religion of Karl Marx with all its variations,' and the article was accompanied by a photograph of a communist firing squad shooting Christ's statue on the Cerro del Angel in Madrid.

In 1941 'The Times' published an article beginning 'The clearest feature of the new regime in Spain is its Catholicism. General Franco stands forth as the leader of a modern crusade that has delivered the Western world from Bolshevik attack.' This passing change on the part of 'The Times' from a fairly consistent and hostile attitude towards the anti-communist regime in Spain illustrates the same truth, that the Spanish civil war was, what Spaniards of all classes believed and believe it to have been, 'a Crusade.' As the extracts quoted above show, that is also how it appeared to a contemporary foreign observer.

A few other facts should be recalled, because there is a vast amount of tendentious and inaccurate material in the files of the daily press, libraries, and the shelves of organisations such as the Imperial Parliamentary Association and Chatham House that must be consistently refuted, otherwise there will inevitably be established a history of the origins of the Spanish war that will be as false as is that generally accepted of the origins of the French Revolution.

It was never true that the terror, crimes, and excesses in Spain were the natural and spontaneous reply of the proletariat and peasantry to an aristocratic and clerical oppression, which were at that time non-existent. The bloody popular tribunals, the torture chambers, and the savage brutalities to priests and nuns were the studied inventions of Russian communism, which taught and inflamed the ignorant masses to their use.

The theory that the republican government was legal and democratic dies hard, although the very President of that government, Sr Alcalá Zamorra, and outstanding historians like Sr de Madariaga have declared that the elections were fraudulent and the parliamentary majority a faked one.

The theory that a revolution was started by a rising of army generals under General Franco will not hold water against written contemporary evidence and the proved authenticity of the communist document for setting up a Soviet in Spain, which is reproduced in 'World War in Spain' (John Murray, 1939). The revolution was planned by Lenin in the early 1920's, and carried out by him and Stalin during the subsequent years, of which there is also ample documentary evidence from Communist sources \* ; General Franco's rising was the counter-revolution.

The theory that foreign intervention in the civil war was chiefly that of Hitler and Mussolini on the side of General Franco is a myth because the intervention of Russia and France on the republican side not only preceded it but was much more important and cost Spain the robbery of all her gold reserves and the terror. General Franco never sold himself to Germany, though Dr Negrín sold himself to Russia during the civil war, while in the Second World War he steadily maintained Spain's neutrality, refused to join the Axis, and denied Hitler a passage through Spain to Gibraltar and Africa, as subsequent evidence at Nuremberg, from Hitler's letters to Mussolini and from our own Admiralty publications,† have proved. General Franco was not primarily pro-German or pro-British but pro-Spanish and fortunately (for the Allies) thought it best to balance himself on the tight-rope of neutrality.

The theory that Spain was the tool of the Axis is exploded by the fact that General Franco refused to join it. Not only was Spain's neutrality vital for the success of the landings in North Africa in 1942, but the pro-German actions of General Franco and Falanje were offset by many concessions to the allies, which have been detailed in the book of Prof. Carlton Hayes, the U.S. Ambassador to Spain.‡

---

\* 'Conflict in Spain,' G. M. Godden, 1937.

† 'Führer conference on Naval affairs 1940.'

‡ 'Wartime Mission in Spain,' Macmillan, 1945.

It is necessary to repeat these things now, when the Western nations of the world are at the long last refusing to play to Stalin's baton and beginning to understand that Spain has fought and is fighting their own battle. The classic communist procedure of supporting and working with socialist and other left-wing parties until the moment comes to betray and liquidate them was clearly illustrated in Spain fifteen years ago, and more recently in Poland, Hungary, Rumania, and Czechoslovakia, where socialism has been the bridge to communist control.

The reign of terror, the Cheka torture chambers, and the assassination in cold blood of from three to four hundred thousand Spaniards under the regime of the Republicans are not forgotten in Spain and will not be forgotten in other countries where they are being imitated on a grandiose scale. The only defence ever made for them was not a denial but merely a 'tu quoque' without evidence. Nor should the fact be forgotten that organised persecution of Christianity was a policy of the Republic, resulting in the martyrdom of bishops, priests, nuns, and tens of thousands of laymen merely because of their Christianity. The world is now more hardened with the sight of these things in Russia, Poland, and Yugoslavia, but twelve years ago well-intentioned people found them so difficult to believe that even a few prominent Anglican divines were protagonists of the Reds and contributed to the general blindness as to communist doctrines and practice.

How clear was the vision of Spanish statesman in 1943 and how opaque that of our own is illustrated by the following quotations from Lord Templewood's book,\* which can be read with advantage on this theme, though it is generally more reliable as autobiography than as history :

*Extracts from the Memorandum by the British Ambassador as a basis of conversation with Count Jordana on Feb. 19, 1943.*

*The alleged Russian peril*

' . . . If therefore there were a Russian danger to European civilisation, the blame should rest entirely on Nazi Germany.

The British Government do not however admit this danger. The victory at the end of this war will be an allied not a Russian victory, namely a victory in which the British Empire

---

\* 'Ambassador on Special Mission.'

and the United States of America will exercise the greatest possible influence. Moreover Mr Stalin declared on Nov. 6, 1942, that it was not the future policy of Russia to interfere in the internal affairs of other countries.

This being so the British Government see no justification either for . . . or the idea . . . that Russian victories mean a communist domination of Europe. . . . They look forward therefore to a post-war continent in which the historic countries of Europe will preserve their traditions and institutions and will be able to enjoy them. . . .'

*Extracts from the reply of General Jordana, the Spanish Foreign Minister.*

'An error frequently made by nations is to suppose that the world remains fixed in a particular international situation. . . . Communism is the great danger threatening the world and if in addition it appears supported by the formidable force of a great Power it is natural that all those who are not blinded by their actual situation should feel alarm. We Spaniards are not alone in feeling this alarm, since it is shared by other nations and principally those who are near to Russia. The sympathies of those countries go undoubtedly towards anything which constitutes an opposition to the Soviet forces and if Russia were victorious we consider England too would certainly have to take up this attitude. . . . Is there anybody in the centre of Europe, in that mosaic of countries without consistency or unity, bled moreover by foreign dominations, who could contain the ambitions of Stalin? There is certainly no one.'

*Extracts from the observations of the British Ambassador in a conversation with the Spanish Foreign Minister, Feb. 25, 1943.*

'The Minister says that the great danger to Europe is communism and that a Russian victory will make all Europe communist. The result as he believes will be the destruction of European civilisation and Christian culture. The British view is very different, and I suggest that it is well worthy of the Minister's careful attention.'

*Extract from a letter sent by General Franco to the Duke of Alba for transmission to Mr Churchill dated Oct. 18, 1944.*

'I feel it quite natural that great differences have existed until now between the attitude of Great Britain and the Spanish attitude, Spain being neutral and therefore freer from commitments and more dispassionate; but as the war proceeds our identity of interests becomes clearer as do the

preoccupations with the future apparent in the speeches, declarations, comments, and journeys of the Prime Minister.

Since we cannot believe in the good faith of Communist Russia, and since we know the insidious power of Bolshevism, we must take account of the fact that the weakening or destruction of her neighbours will greatly increase Russia's ambition and powers, making necessary more than ever an intelligent and understanding attitude on the part of the Western countries. . . .

Once Germany is destroyed and Russia has consolidated her preponderant position in Europe and Asia, and once the United States has consolidated her position in the Atlantic and Pacific, thus becoming the most powerful nation in the universe, European interests will suffer their most serious and dangerous crisis in a shattered Europe.

What we deduce from that is clear reciprocal friendship between England and Spain is desirable. I have no hesitation in saying so, and this need will be the more imperative, the greater the destruction inflicted on the German nation. . . .

History shows that it is not difficult to win the friendship and the heart of Spain.'

Previous articles in the 'Quarterly' have described in detail how the United Nations pursued Spain through the conferences from San Francisco to Lake Success, where in November 1946 the international boycott was finally decided, resulting in the farcical withdrawal of three heads of missions from Madrid. As Russia's popularity in the U.N.O. began to wane, more and more nations (chiefly Latin American) recognised the justice of Spain's cause, as is shown in the following figures of the votes given against Spain in the successive General Assemblies.

|                           |     |     |     |           |
|---------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----------|
| At San Francisco          | ... | ... | ... | 50 states |
| „ London                  | ... | ... | ... | 44 „      |
| „ New York, December 1946 | ... | ... | ... | 34 „      |
| „ „ „ November 1947       | ... | ... | ... | 28 „      |

When the session of the U.N.O. opened at Lake Success in November 1947, the Spanish question was taken up where it had been left in December 1946, with the resolution of boycott and the withdrawal of the heads of three diplomatic missions. Russia and her satellites led the attack as in the former sessions of the U.N.O. in an attempt to obtain a new resolution reaffirming the boycott and of applying further sanctions to Spain. The lengthy



debates showed an increase of supporters for Spain among whom Argentina, the Dominican Republic, Costa Rica, Peru, and El Salvador were prominent. The U.S.A. attitude was also more friendly to Spain and constituted a notable *volte-face*.

On November 12 the Political Committee approved the following resolution for submission to the General Assembly, the voting being twenty-eight in favour, including Britain and the U.S.S.R., six against, and twenty-three abstentions, including the U.S.A.

'In view of the fact that the Secretary General in his annual report informed the General Assembly of the steps taken by the States members of U.N.O. in conformity with the latter's recommendation of Dec. 12, 1946, [the General Assembly reaffirms its resolution passed on Dec. 12, 1946, with regard to relations between the United Nations members and Spain] and expresses confidence that the Security Council will do its duty in accordance with the charter in so far as it will deem that this is required by the situation as regards Spain.'

On Nov. 17, 1947, the paragraph of this motion included in brackets was presented separately to the General Assembly and defeated, for it failed to get the necessary two-thirds majority. Twenty-eight countries including Great Britain and the U.S.S.R. voted in favour, sixteen countries including the U.S.A. against, and thirteen abstained. The remainder of the motion, not included in the brackets, was then presented and approved, the voting showing that thirty-six countries including Great Britain, the U.S.A., and the U.S.S.R. voted in its favour, five voted against, and sixteen abstained or were absent. Features of the debates were an important pro-Spanish speech by Dr Arce, the Argentine delegate, and the extraordinary procedure which allowed Sr Alvaro de Albornoz, the present pretender to the title of President of the Spanish Republic in exile, to take part in the debate, while the Spanish government, which had been recognised by almost all the members nations, was not even heard.

This session of the U.N.O. was closed on November 30 and marks the end of a long campaign, which brought discredit to the U.N.O. and did small damage to Spain except to try her pride and her patience.

Throughout the subsequent months the international position of Spain continued to improve *pari passu* with

the decline of the prestige of the U.N.O. and with the exhibition of Russia's imperialist and communist activities. This improvement was illustrated by a series of international acts of friendship and agreements during 1947 and 1948, among which were trade agreements with Holland, Eire, Mexico, Portugal, Switzerland, Italy, Uruguay, Chile, Sweden, and Turkey, and the establishment of diplomatic relations with Bolivia and Iraq. The development of friendly relations with Argentina were especially marked. In defiance of the 1946 resolution of the U.N.O., Argentina had sent an ambassador to Madrid; a mission of planes and their crews of the Argentine air force visited Spain and also an Argentine military mission, while General Franco and President Perón exchanged compliments and presents.

On April 9 there was signed in Buenos Aires an ample trade agreement under which Argentina provides Spain with credits for 1,750 million pesos, the equivalent of 4,500 million pesetas; these credits are to be used preferentially for the purchase of food and raw materials from Argentina.

The most notable change of attitude towards Spain appeared in public and official opinion in the U.S.A. during the early months of 1948, as the formation of a Western anti-communist bloc became established and it was appreciated that Spain and Portugal would be powerful and necessary elements of that bloc and would probably be included in the Marshall Plan; in fact on March 30 the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Chamber of Representatives by a large majority passed a motion in favour of doing so.

In the plenary session in Paris on March 16 of the representatives of the sixteen nations accepting the Marshall Plan, Sr Caeiro de Mata, the Portuguese Minister of Foreign Affairs, proposed that Spain should be invited to join the group. Though the same session unanimously approved the inclusion of Western Germany, the Portuguese proposal was coldly received and not even discussed.

Though Anglo-Spanish trade continued to increase and on March 28 a payments agreement was signed between the two countries, yet the British official attitude up to the end of that month apparently continued to be hostile to the government of General Franco and to be playing

with the dangerous and unrealistic idea of fostering an opposition government, composed of some of the exiled republican politicians and of the extreme monarchists opposed to General Franco.

In the January 'Quarterly' was described the record of Sr Prieto, how he was one of the most prominent promoters of the Spanish revolution and civil war and collaborators with Russia, and how his reception by the Foreign Secretary in September 1947 had caused great offence in Spain. In October the press reported that Sr Prieto and Sr Gil Robles, a prominent monarchist and conservative leader, had met in London and had been received by Mr Bevin with a view to obtaining his support to a combination destined to replace General Franco's regime. This called forth an energetic protest from the Spanish government stating that 'political machinations against the Spanish government have recently taken place in London with the connivance of the British Foreign Minister constituting an intolerable attempt on his part to interfere with Spain's internal affairs.'\* It was also reported in the press that Don Juan had sent a note to the Spanish government disauthorising Sr Gil Robles as his spokesman. On November 15 Mr Bevin answered Spain's protest in a peremptory manner and repeated his disapproval of the Spanish regime and his hope that it would shortly be replaced by one with which Great Britain could maintain friendly relations. This grave discourtesy was keenly felt in Spain.

Whether there has been any further rapprochement between the other republican politicians in exile and Sr Prieto, who is said to have the money, had not been revealed at the end of March when this is written, but there can be little doubt that a most disturbing element in the Spanish political situation is the continued breach between Don Juan and General Franco, which seems rather to widen than to narrow. There is a strong group of monarchists, who would probably prefer to see the whole edifice of General Franco's Spain crash to the ground to be succeeded by a return to the old personal political parties and the constitution of 1876. It would not seem likely that right-wing monarchist elements would be

---

\* 'Daily Telegraph,' Oct. 25, 1947.

willing to cooperate with a socialist with the record of Sr Prieto, though Spanish character and history make such things credible. But withal General Franco's position is universally considered to be increasingly strong and popular and, should Spain be received into the Western bloc and E.R.P. it would become even more so, while the influence of socialists like Sr Prieto, who formed the bridge by which communism entered Spain, would correspondingly decrease.

One of the fears expressed by monarchist opponents of General Franco is that the succession law of July 1947 was framed with a view to establishing him as a life tenant of dictatorship and possibly of founding in himself a new dynasty. The law re-establishing old titles, which had theoretically been abolished since the revolution of 1931 and gave General Franco power to confer new titles, was also looked on by them with suspicion. It would be necessary to see into General Franco's thoughts to know if this fear has a foundation but, as the succession law stated that Spain was a kingdom to be ruled by a monarch of 'royal blood,' it would seem unlikely.

In November 1947 the Consejo del Reino (Council of the Kingdom) was constituted partly by election and partly by nomination, as established in the law of succession. This Council was a revival of the historic advisory council, which had assisted the Spanish monarchs throughout previous centuries; among its fourteen members were the President of the Cortes, the highest prelate, the captain general of land, sea, and air, the head of the general staff, the president of the Supreme Court, the President of the Spanish Institute, the patriarch of the Indies, and a representative of the municipalities. On February 26 at the Pardo Palace the councillors including General Franco duly took the oath on the crucifix and the Holy Gospels.

The law re-establishing titles (*titulos del Reino*) states that the prerogative of granting and rehabilitating titles belongs to the Head of the State, recognises traditionalist titles granted by the Carlist pretenders and the use by Spaniards of foreign and Vatican titles.

The reference to Carlist titles caused the raising in 'The Times' of the issue of a possible Carlist pretender. This issue has been considered for some years to be dead.

When the octogenarian Carlist Pretender, Don Alfonso

Carlos de Bourbon, died in 1937, the hereditary Carlist claim to the throne and the leadership of the Carlist Party devolved on King Alfonso XIII as surviving heir of the Carlist branch of the family. The Pretender, however, on his deathbed nominated another successor, the Prince Javier of Bourbon Parma, as leader of the Party; this succession, which temporarily caused a split in the Carlist Party, was purely testamentary and lacked the claims of hereditary legitimacy on which Carlism was based.

Just before his death in 1941 King Alfonso XIII renounced his right to the Spanish throne in favour of his son the Infante Don Juan, as the legitimate heir to the throne. The Infante, in a letter to his father accepting the trust, stated: 'I accept the claim to the crown of Spain which falls to me by the inviolable law of history, which by the design of Providence brings to an end the cycle of quarrels over the rights of succession, which were the main cause of the civil wars (Carlist) in the nineteenth century.'

In 1943 the Carlists publicly accepted King Alfonso's son as the legitimate heir and the century-old dispute over the Spanish succession appeared to be dead.

The extent of the present separation between leading monarchists and General Franco is illustrated by the refusal of the grandees to attend the official requiem mass for 'All the Kings of Spain' said at the Escorial and attended by General Franco, his ministers, and the diplomatic corps. This took the place of the customary official requiem mass for King Alfonso XIII said annually on February 28, the day of his death, in the Capuchin church of Madrid, where this year a large aristocratic crowd assembled and recited the rosary in lieu of the mass, which was not allowed. Another illustration was the absence of General Franco from the great aristocratic functions in connection with the wedding of the Duchess of Montoro, the heiress of the great Duke of Alba, premier grandee of Spain and perhaps the greatest living nobleman in Europe.

These incidents and the suppression of a monarchist periodical show a widening of the breach between General Franco and the closest adherents of Don Juan.

Though in Spain there is freedom of speech and of the press regarding foreign affairs, the press is strictly controlled as regards internal affairs and only one voice is

heard. This makes it impossible to appreciate what Spain is thinking about domestic politics, but the intrigues and propaganda of wealthy exiles and communists and the hostility of France have provided a reason for a policy, which the passing of those dangers should bring to an end.

The Spanish budget for 1948 presented to the Cortes in December 1937 gave expenditure at Ps. 15,134,263,308 and receipts at Ps. 15,115,035,702. Spain continues to suffer the universal ills of excessive bureaucratic controls with their consequence, an uncontrollable black market, of inflation, of astronomic state expenditure, and of scarcity of dollars, with which to provide essential imports. Negotiations are proceeding for private loans and credits in the U.S.A., and it is confidently expected that Spain will be admitted ultimately into the western bloc and into participation in the E.R.P. of the United States.

The progress of hydro-electric development, on which Spanish prosperity so much depends, has been remarkable, for the latest statistics give a production in 1946 of 5,466 millions of kilowatt hours against 3,271 millions in 1935. Spanish industries appear to be prosperous in general though handicapped by the restriction of imports of raw materials owing to lack of foreign currency; her exports are on the increase and the press announced the purchase by the United Kingdom of 100,000 tons of the season's crop of oranges.

The unfortunate situation of the closed frontier between Spain and France, which had lasted for two years, came to an end in February-March 1948 amid general satisfaction on both sides of the Pyrenees and negotiations are proceeding for a general trade agreement between the two countries. The first closing of the frontier came from Spain and not from France, as is popularly thought, and it was far more harmful to the latter than the former. It was caused by the anti-Spanish agitation of French communists, who then dominated the French government; this agitation was world wide on the part of communists and their fellow-travellers and the excuse used to foment it was the execution in Spain of one man, Cristino Garcia, represented by them as being wickedly executed for his political opinions. The true story of Garcia is that he was an Asturian fireman, who served as a sergeant in the Red Army in the civil war, after which he fled to France and

served in the resistance. At the end of the war he joined the communist-terrorist school in Toulouse and was sent to Spain where he formed a terrorist band to carry out revolution and sabotage. He was captured in October 1945, tried in the Spanish courts under the usual procedure with his own legal defenders, and was condemned to death for the following crimes :

Murder of the owner of a bar in Canilejos.

Assault with companions on Civil guards in Peregrinos.

Assault and robbery of Ps. 21,000 at the railway station of Paseo Imperial.

Assassination in quarrels of Trillo and Perez two fellow communists in September and October 1945.

Other dregs of the Red Spanish army in France were used by Moscow and the French communists as tools in their attempt to renew the civil war in Spain. In the years 1946-47 there were several inroads into Spain by fully-armed bands of varying numbers, the largest amounting to 1,000 men which attacked through the Val de Aran and were defeated and dispersed by the Spanish Army. The remains of these bands have taken to the inaccessible mountains in various parts of Spain, where they have been joined by other brigands and refugees from justice, so that it is now difficult to say where pure brigandage merges into Russian-directed communism. It was not understood in England how grave at one time was the danger of invasion of Spain on a large scale by international brigades, which necessitated large Spanish army concentrations behind the Pyrenees, and the many incidents were not given publicity by our daily press ; the decrease of communist power in France and the formation of the Western bloc has removed the threat.

It is a common fault, shared by this article, that in dealing with Spain too much attention is focused on political, economical, and material features, whereas Spain's overwhelming claim to the world's attention is her religion and culture. Not only does she possess a classical literature of the golden age of the renaissance, which is second to that of no other nation, and pictures, architecture, and statuary equal to any other schools, but the Hispanic renaissance in culture and the sciences since the civil war, from which it was probably a reaction, is very remarkable. Cervantes and other writers of the



golden age were better known in this country in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries than they are to-day, and the present cultural renaissance is rarely mentioned except in such specialised Hispanic centres as Liverpool University under Professor Allison Peers and the Institute of Spain in London under Professor de Salas.

Some idea of the modern renaissance and its appreciation, especially among Spain's descendants in Latin America, can be gathered from reading the 'Spanish Cultural Index,' a monthly publication of the cultural relations department of the Spanish Ministry of Foreign Affairs; this publication illustrates the many activities in medicine, philosophy, theology, history, and other sciences and also in the arts, belles lettres, music, painting, and craftsmanship. The index also shows that many Spanish professors are lecturing abroad in many countries; the list of these in November-December 1947 included the famous eye-specialist Dr Arruga, who was lecturing at the Royal Society of Ophthalmology in London. In those same months there were exhibitions of Spanish books in places as far apart as Amsterdam and Rio de Janeiro.

The most notable event in cultural activities at the end of 1947 was the fourth centenary of Cervantes, which was celebrated not only in Spain and Spanish-speaking countries, but in many other countries with functions, broadcasts, and publications. In Spain the celebrations opened in October 1947 with the first session of La Asambleá Cervantina de la Lengua Espanola in Madrid, attended by General Franco, his ministers, professors, and academicians, both Spanish and foreign; the president of the Assembly was the celebrated professor don José María Pemán. It was an indication of renascent interest in this country in Hispanic culture that the B.B.C. made a special feature of the celebrations with well-prepared broadcasts to all Spanish-speaking countries and a well executed and illustrated pamphlet.

ARTHUR F. LOVEDAY.



## Art. 4.—DEMOCRACY RE-EXAMINED.

1948 is the centenary of an outstanding year of revolution. In view of the present condition of the world, moreover, it is fitting that we should re-examine democracy. Before we can do so, we must look at the aristocracy that preceded it, and its history goes back very far.

In the earlier Christian Church the authorities held that the soul is passed on from father to son. The doctrine of original sin was based on this belief, which was strongly endorsed by Augustine. This doctrine meant that the soul accumulates qualities as it descends in the ancestry, and, as these differ greatly, there are aristocrats and non-aristocrats. In spite of such challenges as 'When Adam derved and Eve span, Who was then the gentleman?' nevertheless, up to the seventeenth century, political thought was aristocratic. The emphasis on the prince and 'order' was accompanied by emphasis on the low qualities of the common people. Distrust of them, of their unreliability, the fickleness of their affections, their readiness to flock after any will-o'-the-wisp, is common form in all sixteenth-century writers, including Shakespeare. Every one of Shakespeare's plays centres round a court of not lower than ducal status: working people are introduced only as comic characters.

The great change was brought about by Locke. He taught that there were no innate ideas. If this is so, then all human beings are born equal. But Locke was a Puritan and he and his followers took for granted the directive of the Holy Spirit. Locke's doctrine spread to America and was embodied in the preamble to the American Constitution: 'We hold it to be self-evident that all men are born equal.'

Locke's doctrine spread to France and inspired Rousseau. The latter held that natural man was virtuous: it was civilisation that corrupted: all men are equal. These ideas produced the French Revolution: liberty, equality, fraternity.

'La Révolution a touché à la propriété, en supprimant la propriété féodale: pourquoi, dira-t-on, plus tard, ne pas toucher à la propriété civile?' \*

---

\* Leroy, 'Histoire des Idées Sociales en France.'

Babeuf was hero and leader of the *Conspiration des Egaux* of 1796.

'Les Babouvistes sont les premiers qui, pratiquement, demandèrent, eux, en citant les propos de Rousseau, la suppression de la propriété individuelle pour réaliser plus qu'une égalisation politique : une totale égalisation de fait.' \*

Here was the birth of *economic* democracy, the beginning of the struggle between *bourgeois* and *sansculottes*. The different sections of the middle classes sought the support of the proletariat.

The doctrines of Locke and Rousseau inspired the 'liberal' movement in England to the rhapsodies of Price.

The romantic reaction against reason was born of disillusionment with the age of revolution which closed the age of reason. It gave new importance to history and condemned abstract theory.

Hegel was in reaction against the individualism of the Enlightenment. His dialectic posited the embodiment of the *Geist* in the State. This gave him immense influence in Russia. There came the belief in the State itself as the supreme object of the citizen's fanatical service.

The Industrial Revolution developed. It was almost universally believed that certain economic principles, such as buying in the cheapest market and selling in the dearest, were as binding as natural laws, and workers, men, women, and children, were exploited in ways that are now horrifying. The rationalist fallacy persisted, and it was held that if the franchise were extended, intelligent voters would solve the problem. The experiment was repeated until manhood suffrage was adopted.

The revolutions of 1848 all proclaimed the principles of liberty, equality, and fraternity, but already a rift had opened between those who were primarily concerned with liberty and those who put equality first. Lamartine and his individualists wanted the powers of government to be reduced to a minimum and its subjects to be set free to pursue their own purposes in competition with each other. Louis Blanc and his Socialists wanted the powers of government to be used to establish equality. Blanqui, chief nineteenth-century descendant of the Babouvists, invented the idea and the phrase, 'the dictatorship of the

---

\* Leroy, 'Histoire des Idées Sociales en France.'

proletariat.' The 'Manifesto of the Communist Party' was published in 1848. It advocated that the State should be 'the proletariat organised as the ruling class.' Marx and Engels dismissed as 'superstitious twaddle' all ideas of justice, human rights, and Christian love, and repudiated all ethical conceptions as 'class morality' and insisted on violence to achieve the victory of communism by 'liquidating the exploiters' and usher in the classless society. 'The dictatorship of the proletariat' was not used by Marx until 1850. Marx asserted an objective reality which determines consciousness.

Lecky understood democracy as meaning 'the exercise of political power by majority as the basis of manhood suffrage.' In his view this implied a permanent monopoly of power for the artisan class, the most numerous and also the least informed of the community. It could not, he maintained, be presumed to be any more virtuous than any other class and would use politics to further its own interests. Since it had little and desired much, it would be more aggressive than a contented oligarchy with a secure social ascendancy. Drawn mainly from those whom a competitive economy had relegated to the lowest rung in the social ladder, its members would try to compensate for their intellectual mediocrity by their collective strength; and being, by virtue of its numbers, its growing discipline, and its key position in the economic order, more powerful than any other class, it would break conventional and moral restraint in the exercise of sovereignty. The State would become a mechanism for the expropriation of the well-to-do. Taxes would be confiscatory, and private ownership gradually abolished.\*

Lecky held that the authority of the Commons was being challenged by the new doctrine of the mandate, which confined the duties of a member to the faithful reflection of his constituents' opinions. The legislator was thus in the position of a servant who, to avoid dismissal, had to resort to flattery as flagrant as any that disfigured the most corrupt courts. The proletariat was the most influenceable of all classes, a gift to wire-pullers and agitators. Legislation would not be the result of mature public consideration and debate but a series of corrupt

---

\* 'The Times Literary Supplement,' Nov. 22, 1947.

bargains struck in party caucuses and with powerful interests in the State.

Lecky saw no objection to the State's managing public utilities so long as those branches of industry which had not yet reached the peak of their development and which therefore needed enterprise and risk-taking management remained in private hands. But Lecky regarded Socialism that went beyond this as a return to restrictive industrial and commercial practices (of the guild system and the mercantilism of Tudor and Stuart times). He believed that, by concentrating the means of subsistence under the control of government, it would destroy liberty. He was still more concerned at what he regarded as the certainty that it would retard production. It would destroy the relationship between effort and remuneration. If the restrictive practices of trade unions continued, harsh circumstances would one day convince the people that wealth is created by labour, not legislated into being.\*

In the second half of the nineteenth century, people, finding that the problem of democracy had not been solved, said, 'Ah, but of course, how can we expect men to vote wisely if they cannot read?' The Rev. Lawrence Scott (brother of C. P. Scott), a protagonist in the cause of popular education, assured me with the utmost emphasis that all of his colleagues and himself went in for the fight in the full belief that, if people were taught to read, they would, in their own interest, read good books like John Stuart Mill on 'Liberty.'†

Sorel wrote :

'Government by the mass of the citizens has never been anything but a fiction. No attempt has ever been made to justify this singular paradox by which the vote of a chaotic majority is supposed to produce what Rousseau called the "general will," which is infallible.'

At least since 1897 Mr Bernard Shaw has been a fierce and constant critic of democracy. The passages are too many to quote ; one may suffice :

'Our plan of One Simpleton One Vote, in which the far-sighted candidate is defeated by the nearsighted one, the

---

\* Acknowledgments to the same article.

† He confessed his disillusionment when he found they really wanted 'the sporting tissue.'

effective doer by the eloquent talker, the reluctant volunteer for a heavy duty by the ambitious climber who seeks authority as a notable addition to his self-importance, is an impracticable figment. Our wisest have no chance under it, being misunderstood, disliked and feared, rather than admired and obeyed.'

At the end of the nineteenth century an observer might well have recalled how an acute Frenchman analysed the virtues of Victorian England :

'*l'esprit de famille, le goût de travail régulier, le respect des supériorités, des lois et des traditions, les sollicitudes prévoyantes, les habitudes religieuses.*'

The disillusion of the Boer War, which discredited Toryism, Victorianism, and Imperialism, also dismissed the aristocratic as an ideal and exalted in its stead the cult of the little, long-suffering citizen.

Sir Flinders Petrie in 'The Revolutions of Civilisation' drew attention to the life-history of a civilisation. The first necessity is law and order and this is established by a military conqueror. He rewards his generals by making them nobles. In course of time they establish power against the monarchy. Then comes aristocracy. Thereafter arises the middle class. There is a sequence of phases reaching their apogees in turn—sculpture, painting, literature, music, mechanics, science, wealth. At this stage unequal possessions make it possible for able but less prolific people not to be swamped by the merely more prolific. 'Then gradually the transformation to democracy takes place. When democracy attains full power, the majority without capital necessarily eat up the capital of the minority, and the civilisation steadily decays.'

At the beginning of this century, although we had 684 persons to the square mile (compared with 40 in North America and 20 in Russia to-day), importing two-thirds of their food, our people had the highest standard of living ever attained by any people up to that time. One penny could buy two eggs, 2 lb. of potatoes,  $\frac{1}{4}$  lb. of stewing beef, four fresh herrings, a pair of real kippers, a smoked haddock,  $\frac{1}{2}$  a pint of fresh milk rich in cream, a hot saveloy, 1 lb. of bread, 1 lb. of apples, a large cabbage, a head of celery,  $\frac{1}{2}$  lb. of tomatoes, 7 lb. of coal, four bundles of firewood; lamp with glass container, wick, and reflector; a quart of

oil; four candles; a dozen boxes of matches;  $\frac{1}{4}$  lb. of soap;  $\frac{1}{4}$  lb. of sweets.\*  $\frac{3}{4}$ d. bought an ounce of tea or fresh butter. A man could cross the Atlantic for 3*l.*, which sum included his food. Problems of supply were solved not by controlled planning but by individualist planning to get profit by supplying demands in competition.

When popular education had not solved the problem of democracy, people said, 'Ah, but we have left out half the population. Bring into politics the ennobling influence of women. Women will naturally elect women.' The franchise was extended to women, but few women have been elected and the problem of democracy was not solved.

In recent years we have heard from Dr L. P. Jacks and President Roosevelt of the Common Man. In a letter to 'The Times Literary Supplement'† Mr Kenneth B. Schofield said:

'In my belief, based on many years' experience, the working and lower middle classes are very little given to reading anything but the most ephemeral matter,‡ and their homes are almost bookless, barren, indeed, of any cultural influence. . . . The middle classes buy more books and read more books. But how much of this reading and book-buying is dictated by fashion and the desire to pose? My own guess is that there is a fairly constant proportion (a very small minority) of genuine book-lovers produced by every class. . . . One can only hope that the world of the common man will not prove to be a very common world.'

Even the 'liberal university' has been described as a collection of people lacking common convictions, pursuing unrelated specialisms, and using their supposed 'neutrality' as a pretext for evading discussion of fundamental questions.

Mr Charles Morgan in 1932 put into the mouth of a character in 'The Fountain':

'Democracy is greed and indiscipline and selfishness and the throttling of the best by the many.'

In 1934 Mr T. S. Eliot wrote of 'the land of lobelias and

---

\* Letter in 'The Times,' Oct. 28, 1947.

† April 12, 1947.

‡ Only 25 per cent. of the total population is attracted to public libraries.

—R. F. R.

tennis flannels.' In 1937 Mr Aldous Huxley in 'Ends and Means' said :

' Where the destiny of *nations* is at stake, we entrust the direction of affairs to men who cannot do the work or even understand what it is about, men without ability or even education.'\*

In 1945 Mr Huxley reported :

' People thought they would turn prairies into wheatfields, and produced deserts ; proclaimed the conquest of the air, and found they had defeated civilisation ; chopped down vast forests to provide the newsprint demanded by that universal literacy which was to make the world safe for intelligence, and got erosion and the popular press.'

As time went on and the problem of democracy was not solved, people said, ' The problem is not political, as has been thought, it is economic. Give the babies milk and orange-juice. Give family allowances. Give children at school free meals and milk. Keep them at school until they are sixteen and part-time till eighteen. Send as many as possible to the universities. Educate for leisure. Provide economic security from cradle to grave. Give the people leisure. And then they will vote wisely and act wisely.'

Money was important to the workers as a protection against poverty. Money was important to people in general because they were able to buy things. Therefore people worked hard. Therefore things were cheap. Granted a national minimum standard of living and honest economic reward for piece-work, the cheaper things can be produced the better for the community as a whole, especially the poor. Cheapness is the best method of distribution.

There developed the idea of ' social justice.' What is the just economic reward for the conductor of an orchestra, on the one hand, and a labourer who lays sewers, on the

---

\* ' Mr Horner said that one Sunday evening last January he was called to the Ministry of Fuel and Power and told that unless coal could be brought to London by Wednesday of the following week, London would come to a standstill. " It was then, for the first time in my life that I appreciated what coal means to a great city like this and how much depends upon the labour of those employed in the industry."—' The Times,' Dec. 9, 1947. Mr Frederick Burrows, ex-railway porter, was appointed Governor of Bengal and, on India becoming a Dominion, was appointed Chairman of the Land Commission for Britain.



other? Nobody can answer that question. Up till recently we have proceeded on the practical way of finding how much it was necessary to pay a person in order to get specific work done. The production of goods and services in competition has provided our sole criterion of prices. In selling, price is all-important. It is better to have wages low and things cheap than wages high and things dear.

Our seller's market is coming to an end. We got the start in the Industrial Revolution and earned a living by selling manufactured articles abroad. Other countries have since adopted the Industrial Revolution and have gone into international trade. We are in the unfortunate position of having a population too small to compete with America and too large to maintain by primary production. It is in these circumstances that, owing to the social services, inflated wages, and inadequate production, most of the fears of poverty have disappeared and it is difficult to get things to buy. Money has lost power as an incentive: people try to get it without working hard.

Some of the chickens are coming home to roost. There has been a good deal of congratulation over increased production of coal: but there are facts on the other side that call urgently for consideration. After 1918 British exports of coal were going as before 1914. Between 1911 and 1921 our mining forces increased by 17 per cent. In 1935 we exported 39 million tons to 56 countries (then there were 15,000 salaried officials; there are now 22,000). In 1938 Denmark exported to us 120,000 tons of butter for 4 million tons of coal and coke. 1941 was the last year the industry was run under private enterprise. With at least 22,000 fewer colliers than now, the output was 23 million tons more. Coal cut by machinery in 1938 was 59 per cent. In 1945 it was 72 per cent. Since then, great additions of apparatus of all kinds have been made. Nevertheless, output of deep-mined coal has declined. It is open-cast that provides the optimism.

As to the cost of coal, that of production during the first half of 1947—the first six months of nationalisation—increased by about four shillings a ton. The increase was mainly due to the five-day week. On the coal sold there was a loss, which increased in the second half of the six months. The public has paid 100L. million more for



the smaller quantity got than in 1941. Since 1939 there has been a total average increase in the price of coal of twenty-six shillings a ton. (It is significant that the Australian Government has abandoned its nationalised shipping industry and the French Government is holding an inquest on its nationalised industries.)

Partly as consequence of the rises in the price of coal, the cost of transport has gone up, and this is added to a wide range of costs. The prices of gas and steel have risen. It takes two tons of coal to make a ton of steel, and therefore the prices of steel and everything made of it must go up.

As to wages in general, the T.U.C. insists that wages be left to negotiation between employers and trade unions, irrespective of consumers and the general interests of the nation. Most people think of themselves as income-getters only, and not as consumers or contributors.

While wages go up, expenditure on essentials is kept down by subsidies. Add to this immense *borrowings* and the constant effort to make the level of the consumption of essentials independent of the level alike of national and individual production, and it is plain that the price-mechanism is stultified and that these measures conceal from the vast majority our true position.

If a man's wages go up and his expenditure on essentials is kept down by subsidies, his surplus purchasing power goes on non-essentials—Players, pints, pictures, perms, and pools.

We have inordinate spending on alcohol. Ten shillings a head a week is paid for it. Of all the money spent on food and drink, 29.2 per cent. goes on alcohol. The people of Britain are drinking more beer than at any time during the last thirty years. For every man, woman, and child 200 pints are brewed per annum. In one year the Scottish whisky distillers alone consumed 250,000 tons of barley; we turn food into alcohol and export it in order to import food! There are 629,000 people engaged in the alcohol industry. 60,000 people are employed in growing barley for it and 11,000 in growing hops. In 1946 we imported 6,888,956 gallons of rum, 7,783,792 gallons of wine, and more port than any other country in the world—1,100,000 gallons. During the first half of 1947 Britain's port-wine purchases increased five fold. The United States during

the same period reduced her imports of it to a tenth of her 1946 purchases. In January 1948 our Government issued licences for the importation from the West Indies of the equivalent of thirteen million bottles of rum in bulk and six million bottles of rum.

As to tobacco, the average smoker pays ten shillings a week in tax. In the financial year 1946-47, tobacco revenue showed a rise of 60% million over the previous year. In 1946 the quantity of tobacco imported, chiefly from the United States, was 370,000,000 lb., compared with 313,000,000 lb. in 1945. In 1924 we consumed 3,000,000,000 cigarettes a month; in 1946 we consumed 8,100,000,000.

Alcohol and tobacco account for between 82 and 83 per cent. of our 'optional spending.' In 1946 we spent 31 per cent. more on our food than in 1938, 130 per cent. more on alcohol, and 240 per cent. more on tobacco. The increase in the annual expenditure on alcohol and tobacco from 1938 to 1946 was 81% million. The amount spent on rates in 1946 was considerably less than half the amount spent on beer and spirits and less than half the amount spent on tobacco.

Reasonable recreation ought to be indulged in, but is it reasonable that between 1938 and 1946 expenditure on household goods increased by 25 per cent. but the increased spending on entertainment was 179 per cent.?

There can be no doubt that gambling is a social menace. We pretend that it is sport that we are interested in, but when the bookmakers once went on strike, the track was all but deserted. The totalisator figures for the Greater London area rose from 22,593,525% in 1938 to 103,376,843% in 1946. In greyhound racing it is estimated that the average backer is prepared to keep on making bets during an evening until he has lost thirty shillings. Football betting is the eleventh largest business in Britain. The total turnover of gambling in 1946 was between 710% and 885% millions.

The attendance at various forms of sport is a menace to work.

Mr G. L. Schwartz, the financial expert, wrote in an article in 'The Sunday Times' of Nov. 16, 1947:

'To finance the food subsidies and social services in 1948, the community will be imperatively required to spend over 1,600%.

millions on alcoholic drinking, smoking, and pool-gambling—more than its whole food bill. If it does not indulge to that extent, the budgetary finances will collapse. Booze, bacey, and betting! Are these the foundations of the New Jerusalem? Save on soap and bath-water, but drink, brothers, drink, and smoke, comrades, smoke. You have nothing to lose but your brains.'

Can anyone be so blind as not to see the writing on the wall? These are the 'bread and circuses' of ancient Rome, and one result of them is vast misdirection of labour from essential to non-essential work.

The tyranny by the trade unions continues. Trade unions in industries immediately essential hold the community to ransom, whilst injuring themselves and their fellows thereby. As we have seen, the T.U.C. insists that wages be left to negotiation between employers and trade unions irrespective of consumers and the general interests of the nation. 'Seldom,' wrote 'The Times,' 'can pompous verbiage have so inadequately disguised the shirking of a public duty.'\* For it will be demonstrated that for us wages are in the long run determined by the prices at which we can sell goods to countries from which we can get food and raw materials. At a meeting of the executive council of the Federation of Independent Trade Unions—the federation represents unions outside the T.U.C.—it was reported that the Minister of Labour had refused to receive a deputation because questions on trade unionism must be dealt with through the T.U.C. The meeting unanimously resolved to call the attention of the thirteen million non-T.U.C. workers to the fact that the Government were not permitted to hear any views except those of the seven million workers in T.U.C. unions. The national policy on wages is decided by the T.U.C., which represents a fraction of the workers. But surely it ought to be decided by Parliament. We are already being governed by something like Mussolini's corporative state. Lord Nathan, Minister of Civil Aviation, and Mr Lindgren, Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry, accepted invitations to attend as guests of honour the luncheon of the committee of foreign air lines representatives in Britain held in the Savoy Hotel during a strike at the hotel. An

---

\* Dec. 31, 1947.

hour before luncheon an official of the Ministry of Civil Aviation telephoned saying that the Trade Union Congress was not agreeable to their attending and the ministers did not appear.

The chairman of the Halifax Building Society, speaking in March 1947 said, 'I am indeed sorry to say that in the building trades it is beyond dispute that there is organised restriction of output, an exploiting of the needs of the people for which there can be no excuse.' 'In building and plumbing, delaying procedures which have come to be music-hall jokes are standard practice.\*' In August 1947 seven Hastings bricklayers who had decided to work an hour's overtime during good weather because progress on houses had been slow, largely owing to labour shortage, were suspended by the local branch of the bricklayers' union. Ten Polish carpenters were employed on the building of new houses at Paul's Grove, near Portsmouth, as labourers until the Ministry of Labour could supply them with tools. When the tools arrived, the Union forbade the Poles to be employed as carpenters, although fifty additional carpenters were needed. There is the insufferable tyranny of the closed shop.

In 1946 reduced hours of work were introduced in nearly fifty industries. Yet the War Office has announced that because the needs of industry must come first, Territorial camps in 1948 must not last more than eight days. In a lecture to the Institute of Transport, Mr H. T. Dutfield, director of Messrs H. and T. Dutfield, haulage contractors, said that the five-day week was rendering vehicles useless for nearly half the week. Sir Robert Johnson, chairman of Messrs Cammell Laird, said that the 44-hour week is not yielding the promised results commensurate with the 47-hour week. The Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Supply said at a works in December 1947, 'I have seen perhaps a couple of hundred chaps knocking off seven minutes early. That means 200 times seven minutes' production loss. If these seven minutes were deducted from their pay packets, these fellows would be the first to run to the union about it.'

Another instance of the discouragement from working harder is that in the allocation of houses built by a local

---

\* 'The Times,' Nov. 17, 1947.

authority a principal consideration is the degree of domestic misery and squalor in applicants' homes, and therefore to work harder to improve one's financial or social status reduces one's chances to get a house—while new houses are converted to slums.

The lack in production is largely due to the misunderstanding that if people work harder, they only enrich 'the bosses,' whereas at the worst the capitalists get only a fraction and, apart from this, the workers are working for the community. It is widely believed that our economic problem could be solved by reducing profit, but, in fact, profit in general is within 5 per cent. of the price whereas labour cost is 80 per cent. and, even if profit cost was eliminated, the reduction would not enable us to sell goods abroad and the incentive of profit is necessary to induce employers to put forth effort in enterprise, taking risks and so on. The Cohen Committee showed that in ten typical companies, large and small (as large as I.C.I. with its 43,590,000*l.* capital), 67·5 per cent. of the holders of 1*l.* shares hold less than 200 shares apiece ; 86·6 per cent. hold less than 500. The personal incomes before tax of British citizens in 1946 totalled 8,522,000,000*l.*, of which 2,567,000,000*l.* was classed as income from rent, profit, and interest. This latter included all the earnings of farmers and professional men, as well as the interest paid to individuals, most of whom are neither idle nor wealthy, on their holdings of the national debt and of national savings certificates. Mr Churchill has maintained that the cost of State management takes more from the workers than would ever be taken by the profits of private enterprise. If the workers had been willing to cooperate in private enterprise, they would have been vastly better off to-day.

Mr Marshall, American Secretary of State, has said :

' The basic issue to-day is simply whether or not men are to be left free to organise their social, political, and economic existence in accordance with their desires, or whether they are to have their lives arranged for them by small groups of men who have arrogated to themselves this arbitrary power.'

Once again the individual must work from the incentive of personal and family advance and benefit by the co-operation of all members of the community, not equal and similar but different and naturally graded. Like an

orchestra, to adopt Mr Churchill's simile, the community ought to lead harmony out of non-equal, various contributors.

We have reverted to the Romantic belief that man is naturally good.

'Every son would have his motor cycle  
And daughters ride away on casual pillions.'

What have we made of it? 'The alarming metamorphosis of meadowland into racecourse, mill pond into gasometer, and secret coppice into the harsh publicity of the by-pass road.' Democracy has come to mean underproduction and equal participation in increasing impoverishment, Players, pints, pictures, perms, and pools. We have tended to equate righteousness with municipal gas.

'I have a Vision of the Future, chum ;  
The workers' flats in fields of soya beans  
Tower up like silver pencils, score on score,  
And surging Millions hear the Challenge come  
From microphones in communal canteens  
"No right! No wrong! All's perfect evermore!"'

'Chained to the wheels of progress uncontrolled,  
World masterers with a foolish, frightened face,  
Loud speakers, leaderless and sceptic-souled,  
Aeroplane angels, crashed from glory and grace.'

What is the truth about democracy? People are not born equal but vary enormously. There is a real aristocracy, to be found in all classes. The value of democracy is as protection against tyranny. But this elementary thing, like patriotism, is not enough. The greatest inequality is the equal treatment of the unequal. The task is to get superior people into superior positions and obey them.†

Sir Norman Angell, in 'The Steep Places,' has pointed out that the popular idea that if we settle the economic problems, the others will settle themselves, is untrue: 'ideas, ideologies, doctrines are a much more stubborn

---

\* Mr John Betjeman.

† Siegfried Sassoon.

‡ In 'You Never Can Tell' the Q.C. expresses an opinion: the solicitor says, 'I don't agree.' 'No, of course,' replies the Q.C.: 'if you did, there would be no need to call me in.'

source of conflict than economic interests.' It is now certain that human beings have bad in them. 'From some innate timidity or laziness we are always trying to do without the spirit and obtain the same result by some mechanical substitute. Which, in the last resort, cannot be done.' \* *Pour chasser les démons, il faudrait un prophète.*

We see now the need for a morality that transcends the State. Can we believe, with Mr Day Lewis, that 'the universe is a body wherein all men and all things are members one of another?' Can we see the necessity to recognise the existence of a moral law superior to group selfishness? The ultimate experience (in words of the late Sir Francis Younghusband) bids us stand by what we consider right, regardless of the esteem or reproach of our fellow-men; it upbraids our cowardice if we allow fears or deference to public opinion to shake our loyalty to truth, goodness, and beauty; it demands our absolute allegiance to them in defiance of the whole community or if we rend the community as result. It makes us aim at the good of all individuals and for the sake of a single individual to challenge the community.

R. F. RATTRAY.

---

\* Gilbert Murray, 'Greek Studies.'

# Art. 5.—REPLACING LOST MERCHANT SHIPS.

WHEN the Second World War was nearing its end few, if any, could have foreseen that its effects for shipping would be so serious and lasting. Nearly nine years ago British merchant ships were requisitioned to help to protect, as armed merchant cruisers, vessels in keeping the seas during hostilities or to transport troops by sea. Although the fighting ended three years ago some British merchant ships are still carrying on their duties as transports. The large fleets of cargo liners, ordinary cargo vessels, oil tankers, and other classes of ships were also requisitioned, but mostly needed comparatively little alteration in order to enable them to carry on their duties in war-time and they were released earlier from requisition.

None is directly to blame for the length of time during which passenger liners have been prevented from engaging in their ordinary peace-time trading. Millions of troops which had been moved across the oceans throughout six years of fighting had to be returned to their homes, and although the great war had ended the world did not settle down quietly to peaceful conditions. Troops needed to be moved from Australia to Japan to share in its occupation with United States forces, and others had to be deployed in the Netherlands, East Indies, and in Greece. Ships were filled with war-brides and young mothers bound from Europe to Canada, Australia, and other lands. Polish troops and their families had to be moved by sea from one country to another.

There was also an immense demand for transport by Colonial civil servants who were required to re-establish administrations in liberated territories; by business men concerned to reopen their connections with oversea commerce; and by tea planters, tin miners, and others whose duties called them to the East. Many persons who had been prevented from returning to their homes in oversea countries during the war wanted to travel to them at the earliest possible time. Then, wishing to come to the United Kingdom were thousands living abroad, many of them in trying climates, who were ordinarily entitled to leave at periodical intervals which they had been unable to take during the war. Displaced persons scattered throughout the world wanted transport by sea, and there



were the beginnings of immense movements of migrants from the United Kingdom to oversea Dominions.

Much of this traffic could not be kept waiting a day longer than was necessary. Another surprise for most people, at any rate, was the long time required for refitting transports as passenger liners which was in marked contrast to the speed with which passenger liners were converted to transports. This has seemed to illustrate the saying that it is easier to destroy than to construct. All the elaborate fittings of liners were hurriedly removed and replaced by the simplest messing and sleeping accommodation which enabled the ships to carry three or four times the numbers of souls for which they were designed in peace. Instead of taking, as might have been supposed at first thoughts, five or six months for re-fashioning, ships have been nine, ten, and even more than twelve months in the shipyards undergoing internal reconstruction.

The magnitude of the transport movements which still had to be undertaken made it plain that ships could only be released from Government service gradually, and that in order to make substantial progress in meeting the enormous demand for passages many vessels for a period needed to have as little done to them as possible. Yet some of the extreme austerity in which troops had travelled without protest during hostilities clearly needed to be relaxed for the comfort of both service and civilian passengers. Many of the ships, therefore, remained in Government control, but as transports, because in that form they could carry the largest numbers. Some transported entirely, or mainly, troops. The withdrawal of these from India and, later, from Palestine each required the allocation of many ships. Such movements helped to explain why three years after the end of the war a number of the principal lines between Britain and other countries were simply of a skeleton kind for which only one or two ships were available where, previously, several had been regularly engaged.

There is ample evidence that the authorities concerned with the uses to which ships have been put under Government direction have been anxious that liners should resume their ordinary peace-time services as soon as possible. The country has good reason to know that the earnings of commercial shipping are now needed more

than ever to bridge the gap between the cost of vital imports and the lower receipts for exports. Their earnings were important when the United Kingdom was able to rely on its oversea investments to contribute much of the difference. Now that large proportions of these investments have been sacrificed in the fight for freedom a still bigger contribution is urgently called for from shipping.

The Economic Survey for 1948 pointed out that the heavy war-time losses of United Kingdom shipping were reflected in the low figures of net shipping earnings. In 1947 the excess of receipts over payments for shipping was only 17l. millions, and this year it is not expected much to exceed 40l. millions. It was 10l. millions in 1946 and 20l. millions before the war, when the value of the pound sterling was much higher than it is now. Sir Stafford Cripps, Minister of Economic Affairs, in one of his statements early this year said that if the shipping of before the war had been available the net shipping income, with imports continuing at their then restricted level, would have amounted to several times the previous total. As it was, although the country was using a smaller volume of shipping for its own imports the amount available for the profitable cross-trades was less than before hostilities occurred. Then, the oversea expenses of British ships have risen substantially. The necessity of foreign bunkering reduced the net shipping income still further.

Another adverse influence was the heavy cost of repairing ships in foreign ports which the pressure of work on the yards of the United Kingdom made inevitable. Expenditure on both these counts should be less in the current year. Bunkering at home with coal is again practicable, although the cost is high. Great service can be rendered to the country by the development of shipping trades between other countries which enable balances oversea to be earned. Owners of other seafaring nations share in these lines, and some of them have advantages in special concessions in taxation which are most helpful to them in contracting for modern, speedy, and efficient types of ships.

The continued employment of the 'Aquitania,' of 45,000 tons, built thirty-five years ago, illustrates the strong demand for serviceable ships. After doing magnificent work throughout the last war and repeating with

variations her fine record during 1914-18, she was released from Government service in March but has continued in the North Atlantic route by arrangement between Cunard White Star (her owners) and the Canadian Government. She is now able to carry 1,800 passengers. On each voyage priority is given to 1,100 emigrants and the liner is expected to carry 12,000 settlers to Canada this year.

The gradual release of ships from Government service has followed, first, the preparation of plans by the War Office and the Ministry of Transport, the one department stating its needs and the other proposing how they could be met. Competing demands for vessels had to be considered and usually each had to be scaled down drastically. Weight had to be given to relative priorities, and these had to be approved by the Cabinet. Then when it was found that a certain amount of shipping could be saved there had to be determined where, and what, particular tonnage could best be released. Regard had to be paid to the degrees of urgency for passenger ships in the different routes and also to the extent to which ships had already been returned to individual lines so as to ensure, as far as possible, equality of treatment for all. Other influences which needed to be examined included the ability of the shipyards to deal with the work at a time when new construction was heavy. Some relationship had to be maintained between conversion and construction since the refitting of liners required, chiefly, fitters, and the rhythm of the shipyards was interrupted. When ships are being built one stage of construction succeeds another and one set of craftsmen follows its predecessor. Mostly it has been possible for ships to be reconditioned in the yards where they were built, an arrangement which is favoured by all directly concerned. Sometimes when a yard has undertaken fully as much refitting as it could manage and ships were due for reconditioning they have been directed to other centres and the original plans have been exchanged. It has even been said that completely to reconstruct a ship internally is more difficult than to build one afresh from the laying of the keel.

No effort was spared to restore quickly the Cunard White Star liner 'Queen Elizabeth' to her character as a Transatlantic passenger liner in view, especially, of her exceptional capacity for earning hard currencies. She was

the first of the large liners to be released from transport duties and she resumed her regular passenger sailings in October 1946. She was followed in April 1947 by the new 'Mauretania' and in the following July by the 'Queen Mary.' The importance of these ships as earners of dollars was clearly shown at the beginning of this year, when the 'Mauretania' was permitted to make five cruises from New York to the Caribbean Sea, although the demand for passenger vessels in many routes for essential purposes continued to be acute.

This excursion from general service was a good example of private enterprise and of understanding treatment by the Government. It was for the owners to discover and determine the prospects of such employment, to make the project known, and to organise the whole affair, including visits ashore at the ports of call. Their initiative and preliminary expenditure were justified and the ship returned to this country with earnings which represented a reasonable reward for all the effort, while the goodwill of the company had been further cemented. It was to the credit of the Ministry of Transport that at a time when the pressure for shipping in many directions was so great they approved the arrangements.

Incidentally, this development was typical of the way in which the United Kingdom is working effectively for economic recovery. Goods of all kinds which are needed at home, but have been denied to the people, have been exported in vast quantities and have earned balances abroad badly needed to pay for absolutely essential commodities. In the same way the British people, most of whom have been prevented from travelling during the last nine years, would warmly welcome participation in pleasure cruises. These are still denied to them. Yet they are glad that the best British shipping that can be built, equipped, and manned according to the highest standards should be directed abroad, there to accommodate travellers who are in a favourable position to pay for the pleasures of this form of travel and recreation.

Gradually other passenger ships were released and after many months during which they were refitted they have been able to resume trading. A few liners have yet to be directed to the shipyards for refitting. By the end of the year the services should bear closer comparison to

the conditions nine years ago and by the autumn of next year the last of the reconditioning should have been completed. Meanwhile in all the principal routes the waiting lists of prospective travellers remain immensely long. The ability to reduce the numbers substantially is necessarily dependent mainly on the return of the ships to their owners.

Little relief from the acute shortage of liner shipping has yet been provided by new tonnage. Losses of liners during the war were heavy and construction was limited chiefly to simple cargo carriers, since maximum production could be secured with vessels of this type. All building was subject to licensing and until nearly the end of hostilities war purposes were taken into consideration in all plans submitted for approval. Companies began to order passenger liners after the war but their production, rarely rapid in ordinary times, was prolonged by the effects of competition for materials and delays in delivering the immense variety of fittings required for vessels of that class. Ships have often been kept waiting for supplies almost trivial in appearance but yet essential. Electrical fittings and glassware are among such manufactures. There have been delays in delivering small articles of equipment like door-handles. Few new passenger liners have so far been commissioned. Those that have made their appearance include two for the West African trade and two for the North Atlantic. Two for the South African service have been nearing delivery. By the end of this year large liners should be completed for the North Atlantic and for the Australian route. Where there has been competition between the reconditioning of existing ships and the construction of new vessels the choice of giving priority has been influenced by the consideration of which vessel would be finished first, and sometimes the building of new ships has had to give way to the reconditioning of existing ships.

Statistics alone are usually insufficient to disclose a true position. In comparing the shipping available before the war and at the present time the types of vessels are highly relevant. Thus in its latest annual report the Chamber of Shipping first compares vessels of 500 tons gross and over and excludes lake and river vessels, tugs, trawlers, and the like. It finds that the United Kingdom

tonnage declined between Sept. 3, 1939, and Dec. 31, 1947, by 1,378,000 tons to 15,514,000 tons, but that the shipping owned in other British countries increased by 1,381,000 tons to 2,097,000 tons. That gave for the British Commonwealth a trifling rise to 18,611,000 tons. Outstanding among the figures for other countries is a great increase of 24,491,000 tons to 33,213,000 tons inclusive owned by the United States. The Swedish mercantile marine expanded by 287,000 tons to 1,729,000 tons. The total for the world was 75,291,000 tons, an increase of 13,865,000 tons. Of this the Chamber hazarded the view that perhaps nine million tons were in the United States reserve fleet, which would reduce the effective fleet to about 66 million tons gross. It qualified these figures by pointing out that they did not necessarily mean that carrying capacity was greater this year than before the war. Ships were out of action, being reconditioned and for repairs, which in some areas were taking two or three times as long as before the war. Delays in port are formidable and have been referred to by many chairmen. They have not been confined to any country, but have been particularly marked in the United Kingdom and have occurred in all routes. They have the effect of greatly reducing the carrying capacity of a ship in the course of a year. Further, the pattern of world trade is changed.

Passages in ballast are now common, which means that the carrying capacity of a ship is made use of for only part of a round voyage. A main cause has been the continued lack of coal cargoes from the United Kingdom which have only just been resumed this year on a small scale. Outstanding among ballast voyages this year have been the long passages of 12,000 miles of cargo ships from the United Kingdom to Australia to load part of a fine exportable surplus of grain. The purchase of Australian wheat conserves dollars. Whereas grain brought across the North Atlantic involves transport of only 3,000 miles, or of 4,000 miles for the round voyage, the dispatch of ships to Australia empty to load grain means a round voyage of about 24,000 miles.

When the Chamber comes to analyse the constitution of the British mercantile marine for oversea commerce it includes vessels of 1,600 tons gross and upwards and shows the following totals in thousands of tons gross :

|               |  | Owned at 3/9/39 | Owned at 31/12/47 |
|---------------|--|-----------------|-------------------|
| Tramps - - -  |  | 3,858           | 5,393             |
| Liners - - -  |  | 9,221           | 7,165             |
| Tankers - - - |  | 2,977           | 3,313             |
|               |  | <hr/>           | <hr/>             |
| Total - - -   |  | 16,056          | 15,871            |

These figures also need important qualification. The tramp shipping for December 31 last includes about a million tons which are returnable to the United States and Canada, since they have been time-chartered to this country. It also embraces tonnage, put at about 500,000 tons gross, which has been bought by liner companies to help them to maintain their regular services until ships specially designed for the purpose can be commissioned. This amount thus needs to be deducted from the tonnage available for ordinary trading, such as is known as tramp- ing, and to be added to the liner fleets. Excluding these ships and those which are returnable, the ordinary cargo fleet is of similar size to that owned before the war, although some of the newer ships are of higher speed. On the other hand, any advantages from greater speed are now commonly lost through the slower working in port. Although the tanker fleet is now larger than before the war, the great increase in the consumption of oil renders it inadequate and many contracts for new tankers have lately been placed in order to make good the present marked deficiency.

The liner fleet is less by about 1,500,000 tons. The actual volume available this year for services is, however, far less than that apparent owing to the continued employment of liners as transports and to their being out of action undergoing reconditioning.

When considering questions raised in the replacement of war losses managers of liner companies have to try to form views on a variety of issues as, indeed, they and their predecessors had always to do when contemplating construction. As a liner may be expected to be serviceable for at least twenty years, those responsible for policy have to try to determine what kind of accommodation will be favoured many years hence. Irrespective of the type of ship which they think will be most suitable, since the war they have had to provide for an expenditure far beyond any that would have been needed for the building



of a similar ship before 1939; for a year or two before then events were casting shadows in advance, and costs depend on the year with which comparisons are made. Marked variations between quotations then occurred, and if present quotations are compared with those of a time when builders were concerned to secure work for the purpose merely of keeping staffs together, the difference between those prices and the current costs are very much wider than if prices are taken which were ruling when a resumption of naval construction was already exerting a hardening effect.

Whether the increase in price, compared with quotations before the war, be double or treble, much more will need to be earned for the depreciation of the more costly new ship of to-day. As a ship is a wasting asset some percentage of her earnings must be set aside to provide the means of building her successor when her working days are over. Incidentally, when, as at present, prices of new ships are so much higher and depreciation has been calculated on the lower values of existing ships there is a gap which somehow must be met. That, however, is another matter—and a serious one—distinct from other questions now being considered. The manager will also need to allow for the earning of interest on the larger capital represented by a new ship. If he does not see how depreciation and interest can be earned on the capital required naturally he hesitates to contract.

The liner company, however, has its regular trades which it is in business to maintain. If, therefore, a company did not provide tonnage for its purposes it would fail in its functions and the managers must be prepared for others, perhaps bolder, to meet the needs of the trade in their place. This accounts for the apparent anomaly which has been seen during the last year or two when chairmen have said that ships were becoming, or had become uneconomic, and yet they continued to contract. They may not, of course, have seen their way clear at the time to make the ships pay. They may have relied on existing vessels built at lower levels contributing so well to the total earnings that the construction of one or two units at higher levels could be afforded, although they were unlikely to be good profit-earners, because if the companies did not keep pace with the needs of the trade they would to that extent be withdrawing from business.



Much of the rise in costs is quite beyond the control of shipbuilding, which is the greatest assembling industry for products from all parts of the country.

The policy of the successful shipping manager combines caution with enterprise. The latter is essential because he must always be looking ahead and the future invariably is full of uncertainties. Caution tells him that earnings are liable to fluctuations as neither the volume of traffic nor the rates at which it is carried are unchangeable. Were an owner to feel assured that there would be always the same demand for shipping space at there is now, and that the present rates would always rule, he might be prepared to contemplate building on present terms with some degree of confidence. As he cannot do that he is disposed to think he must envisage the possibility of a smaller volume of traffic and lower levels of rates. Even if he could rely on stable traffic and terms of carriage he could not rely on expenses remaining unchanged. There have been particularly sharp reminders this year of the uncertainties in serious rises in the prices of fuel oil, diesel oil, and coal. The rise in the price of fuel oil for steam liners is to be calculated in hundreds of pounds a day.

Having determined what revenue a ship would have to earn to pay her way the manager then needs to decide if passengers should be able to pay the fares required and the cargoes to bear the necessary freight rates. With passenger liners a solution of some of the problems is being sought in the building of larger units, enabling a greater range of fares to be quoted. Those who are able to pay the highest rates will secure the highest degree of comfort in their state rooms. Others whose expenditure must be limited will be offered accommodation of a simpler kind, while all will share the same large public rooms and the same cuisine. So far the case has been advanced of those who wish to travel for private or business reasons. The transport of large numbers of persons proposing to leave the United Kingdom to settle in the overseas Dominions is being treated as a separate issue. They will either be accommodated in ships carrying passengers in ordinary commercial conditions or they will be carried in a number of vessels which are being specially adapted to the purpose on the lines of transporting many more on each voyage than the liners maintaining the regular

services. This movement is probably the most important of the kind ever undertaken.

Throughout the country shipyards are filled with vessels under conversion from war to peace service or under construction, although work does not proceed as quickly as owners or builders would like. Delays in supplies of essential materials and manufactures are the main reasons. Orders for tankers began to pour in at the end of last year and now the total merchant work in hand and to be laid down amounts to as much as 4,250,000 tons gross. Yet the figures of work started and ships launched and completed this year point to an output for the twelve months of about 1,000,000 tons only, unless more steel and other supplies are forthcoming.

The value of the orders on hand is about 300% millions, of which 100% millions represents work for foreign owners. In the White Paper on Capital Investment in 1948 it was pointed out that after the question had been examined carefully the conclusion was reached that it is now quite as advantageous to build ships for British owners as for export, even when they are to be exported to hard currency countries. Besides construction the industry has in hand some 3,000,000 tons for repair or conversion.

What kind of men are responsible for taking important decisions affecting the future of British shipping? Personalities are a powerful force in commerce, as in all other activities. As I watched and listened to the proceedings at the annual meeting of the Chamber of Shipping this year various leaders who spoke seemed to provide the answers. Except in so far as they were not representative of Liverpool, which has long been identified with strong individualists, who have known well how to conduct their own businesses and have their own steamship owners' association, there were delegates from British shipping centres throughout the Kingdom. Liverpool can still claim large private ownerships whose roots extend into the distant past. In the South, with notable exceptions, private firms have mostly yielded place to joint stock companies with managers in charge.

Men from the north, east, south, and west spoke to resolutions. All would not have claimed the gifts of oratory, but all passed the main test of good speaking, since they had essential things to say. The Chamber at

its meeting works to an exact time-table, and no time was lost. It is not practicable to comment on all who spoke with special knowledge of their subjects; in future years some of them may hold higher office at the Chamber. For the present purpose of illustrations three may well be mentioned. The President (who invested his successor with the badge of office) was Sir Ernest Murrant, K.C.M.G., Chairman of Furness, Withy and Co., Ltd., which has interests in many services. He succeeded to that position on the death of the late Lord Essendon, who had also gradually worked his way up to the top from a modest start. Sir Ernest Murrant had been in close contact with him for forty years, starting when the late chairman was Mr Frederick Lewis. Like all the directors of Furness Withy, which has some 15,000 shareholders, Sir Ernest Murrant has spent all his working years in the service of the enterprise. All the members of the board have a reputation for extreme efficiency. He joined the company straight from school and gradually advanced until he was appointed deputy-chairman in 1935. The death of the late chairman brought him home from the Middle East, where he had been a special representative of the Ministry of War Transport since 1941 and supervised British and Allied shipping from Turkey to Aden during most eventful periods of the war.

The present President is Sir George Christopher, whose paternal grandfather, of Cornish farming stock, worked his way from before the mast to the command of sailing ships and who, on retirement from the sea, became a town councillor and eventually an alderman of his native town, St Ives, Cornwall. There he was a contemporary of the late Captain Edward Hain, also a retired master mariner, who owned a small fleet of sailing vessels and who ultimately, in conjunction with his son, the late Sir Edward Hain, built a fleet of steamships under the name of the Hain Steamship Company, Ltd. On the death of the father of the present President of the Chamber after serving in these ships at sea, Sir George Christopher, as a lad of fifteen, joined the company's London office in 1905 at a wage of ten shillings a week. In time he became confidential secretary to the late Sir Edward Hain, in which capacity he served during his chief's vice-presidency and presidency of the Chamber of Shipping in 1909-11,

and later succeeded him as chairman and managing director of the company. Including eight ships under construction, the Hain Steamship Company has a present and prospective fleet of twenty deep-sea cargo vessels of 129,000 tons gross. Twenty-eight ships were lost during the war.

The President's wide experience of cargo shipping well fitted him for the office of Director of Commercial Services at the Ministry of War Transport from 1941 to 1945 after having served for two years as deputy-director. Rising to a high position in British shipping from small beginnings, Sir George Christopher now devotes much time to promoting the welfare of the industry through the Chamber. In his various addresses there run most thoughtful notes and a deeply religious strain.

The new Vice-President of the Chamber is Mr Colin S. Anderson, a manager of the Orient Line, now associated with the P. & O. Steam Navigation Company, which has some 18,000 stockholders. He comes of a family long associated with passenger services between this country and Australia in which originally it was active through sailing ships. His grandfather, his father, and two of his cousins, their partners in business, have all been presidents of the Chamber of Shipping. Since his earliest days he was brought up in the atmosphere of the industry, and he has twice visited Australia on the company's business and worked there for two years. He has particularly concerned himself with the constructional problems of new ships and with industrial relationships for his company and for shipping as a whole. This year he has represented the Chamber as a member of the British Government Delegation to the International Shipping Conference in London on the Safety of Life at Sea, which has been attended by the representatives of thirty nations.

The shipping industry is largely directed by men of these two types, who have either worked their way up from the most junior positions or have had the advantage of close family associations with the industry over long periods of years and its intangible benefit of accumulated experience, which becomes almost instinctive knowledge. Clearly both are well qualified to direct policy which shall maintain and extend the great and vital British mercantile marine.

CUTHBERT MAUGHAN.

## Art. 6.—PSYCHIATRY IN THE CRIMINAL COURTS.

It needs no long or profound experience of our criminal courts to show that cases come for trial which by the normal standards of human conduct are inexplicable. They are beyond the understanding of ordinary men and women either because of the extraordinary nature of the wrongful act itself or because of the apparent incongruity of the act with the circumstances or the personality of the offender. Examples of the first type are certain bizarre sex offences, such as exhibitionism; instances of the second are larcenies committed by persons of ample means who steal articles for which they have neither use nor need.

To the wisest bench—whether it consists of a single judge or a number of justices—all such cases are difficult. A court has a duty of mercy towards the offender; but it has an overriding duty of justice towards the community. A satisfactory reconciliation, at once humane and effective, of duties apparently in conflict with each other is never easy and is sometimes impossible. In these cases a bench is in need of any experienced specialised help it can get. In the majority of courts this need is recognised to-day. But it was not always so. In days not long past it was not at all unknown for medical evidence offered in mitigation on behalf of a convicted prisoner to be received by the bench with open suspicion and distrust. Judges have been known to announce complacently that criminal courts were fully capable of curing such a disease by a prison prescription. There is no doubt at all that serious injustices have taken place through this judicial reluctance to recognise that progress in the scientific study of mental disorder has shown mere deterrent and punitive treatment of certain offenders to be at once cruel and useless. Simple examples have been soldiers with head wounds whose whole characters were changed for the worse by their injuries, and sufferers from *encephalitis lethargica* (sleepy sickness): men of blameless reputation have been known as a result of this illness to commit criminal acts of which they would formerly have been wholly incapable. But such men have been punished as rigorously as if they had been fully responsible for what they did.

To-day in the criminal courts as in many professions and other spheres we hear much of the new science of

psychology and of the marvels of which the psychiatrist\* is capable. It is to the undoubted benefit of the administration of justice that the psychiatrist has devoted considerable attention to the study of anti-social behaviour and especially to crime. There is almost universal agreement that in a proportion of cases psychotherapy, i.e. the treatment prescribed by the psychiatrist, can and sometimes does succeed where the traditional sanctions of the criminal courts would be ineffective. Nor is there any dark mystery about the aims and methods of the psychiatrist. He has given prolonged study to the processes of the human mind. He has devoted himself especially to an examination of those impulses and desires which to the generality of mankind are morbid and abnormal. As a result he claims to possess both a wider experience and a more skilled technique than the non-specialist in discovering and in laying bare processes of thought and motives of conduct which are often unknown even to the patient himself. By detailed and sympathetic discussion and by exposition to the patient of the nature and origin of his particular difficulties, temptations, and abnormalities the psychiatrist aims to make it possible for him to reshape his outlook and to change his conduct.

Dr J. R. Rees has pointed out that it is not uncommon for a bench to give a convicted defendant the well-meant advice to 'go away and pull yourself together.' But, as that eminent specialist has observed, it is a puzzle to the prisoner to do this unless he knows what to get hold of and how to pull. It is precisely here that the psychiatrist offers his help. In the type of case we are considering there is no attempt at any evasion by the offender of his criminal responsibility. The psychiatrist does not come into court in an effort to persuade the bench that the verdict should be 'Not Guilty' or 'Guilty but insane.' His evidence is intended to prove that the prisoner, because of certain mental peculiarities, will be treated more wisely and more humanely and with greater prospects of success by the methods of psychotherapy than by those of mere punishment.

---

\* It may usefully be stated that the title of psychiatrist can legitimately be claimed only by a fully qualified medical man who has taken an additional specialist course of study in psychology and has generally secured a diploma therein.

Some illustrations may be of interest. A.B., aged 15, was charged with shopbreaking. He came from a good home but had been in trouble before, and the police described him as a nuisance in his neighbourhood and a bad influence on other boys. He was far from attractive in appearance, his principal feature being a repulsive squint, and in court was sullen, defiant, and uncommunicative. The justices had been unsuccessful with the boy at his earlier appearances and could make nothing of him now; they wisely sent him to the remand home for a psychological report. The psychiatrist reported that the whole trouble was due to the squint. The boy was continuously teased and taunted by other boys because of his ugliness and the handicap of bad eyesight which made it impossible for him to join in many of their activities. He had gone in for the dangers and risks of shopbreaking merely to prove that in spite of his inabilities he was a lad of high spirit. The chairman of the court, a man prepared to take infinite pains to help boys in trouble, arranged for an operation which entirely cured not only the squint but all tendency to delinquency and the boy has never been in any further trouble.

C.D., aged 20, an inmate of a Borstal institution, gave great trouble by chronic enuresis. All the customary treatments, including repeated punishments, had been tried in vain. The lad declared that he had always had the habit; that the masters and the doctor at his approved school had done everything to cure him without the least success; and that, try as he would, he was incurable. Without very much hope the governor asked the psychiatrist to see him. After exhaustive questioning the specialist discovered that the youth had had a stepfather who was cruel to him as a child. One form of this cruelty had been for the man to beat the child at night as he lay in bed, and the enuresis had originated as the child lay quaking in bed listening in dread for the stepfather's footsteps on the stair. These incidents had faded entirely from the young man's mind until the recollection of them was revived by the questions of the psychiatrist, but the lad declared that he still had nightmares in which his stepfather, with whom he had in fact long since lost all touch, menacingly reappeared. The psychiatrist traced the stepfather and found proof of his death. The young



man was informed ; the enuresis stopped instantly and there has been no recurrence.

It may reasonably be said that these were simple cases and that their cure entailed nothing but a little commonsense. It may be replied with no less reason that, even if that is true, the fact remains that in both cases the cure for a harmful habit was found by a psychiatrist when every other agency had failed. Moreover, I do not think a psychiatrist would resent the description of his speciality as the application of supreme commonsense. Finally, as a layman, I am diffident at recounting and explaining any but simple cases. Here, therefore, is another such case which I met myself.

A boy of sixteen was caught shopbreaking. In the attic of his home were found the proceeds of a dozen crimes—wireless sets, torches, expensive toys, tools, and other things. He had made no attempt to dispose of anything. None of the things had been used. He was an only child, the head of his class at his school, had ample pocket money, an excellent home, and everything he could want. His breakings and enterings had shown great skill and daring. Before the justices he would say nothing and give no explanation of his conduct. Many magistrates would have wanted nothing more. They would have thought it to be a case of theft without any redeeming circumstance and calling for exemplary punishment. The court was wise enough to ask for a psychological report. It disclosed that the boy was under an obsession, not less real because it was absurd, for a fictional character, known as *The Saint*, who figured in the stories of a popular novelist. It was upon the exploits of this rather tawdry modern Robin Hood that the boy had modelled his many thefts. It is not at all certain that conventional punishment would have cured his unwholesome urge ; it would certainly have wrecked his career. On the other hand, a wise talk to the boy which analysed realistically the character of the mythical Saint was completely successful. When the boy understood that, however glamorous between the pages of a novel, such a person would be no more than a squalid public nuisance in real life, the bubble burst. There was no temptation to emulate the actions of a person who had ceased to be a hero and had become a clown. The boy's life was

not interrupted ; he later gained a scholarship and is now doing well.

In the following case, too, it is probable that most people will take the view that some form of medical treatment would have been more sensible than mere punishment. A man of the shopkeeper class was repeatedly convicted of stealing watches. He already owned a watch—indeed as his mania became apparent to his relatives they gave him more watches than he could use. He never stole anything but watches, nor did he make any effort to dispose of them, while his thefts were so clumsy and inexpert that he was constantly detected. He was sent to prison several times without the least effect upon his conduct.

Simple as the cases quoted designedly have been, enough has been said to make it clear that it is impossible to resist the conclusion that there is a considerable field in which the psychiatrist can do effective work. Indeed it seems certain that in suitable cases he can do more practical and successful work than any other agency. There are enough cases on record in which definite and lasting cures have been attained to put such a statement beyond doubt. Such cases include problems both of what are called behaviour states—larcenies and similar offences—and of abnormal sex perversions.

If so much can be said with confidence it may well be thought that all is well. It may be imagined that the psychiatrist has earned his right to recognition in the criminal courts, and that all that remains is for the psychiatrist to develop his specialist knowledge and for the courts to avail themselves increasingly of his advice. But that is far from the truth of the position. The truth is that of the parties interested in these questions not one is satisfied. Psychiatrists complain that their advice is too seldom asked for and too often rejected when asked. Benches complain that advice given them is often contrary to commonsense. And the public, which is the most important party of the three, complains that the psychologist is a crank who does not give the public protection from the criminal which it sorely needs.

These are serious effects, and they are all due to a single cause—the utter absurdity of statements made by certain individual psychiatrists. Such statements are ‘news’

and publicity is inevitably given to them. It is not a matter for surprise that the public, which thus learns that a psychiatrist as an expert witness has committed himself to an opinion in contrast to commonsense, concludes that psychiatry is a fraud. This would not greatly matter if the public did not go on to draw the deduction that criminal courts which based their sentences on the advice of psychiatrists were failing to administer impartial justice. Nor is it hard to see how this idea arises. Psychological experts appear in criminal cases only as witnesses for the defence, and it is only the well-to-do defendant who can afford such a witness. Psychological extravagances which pretend to explain and to excuse misconduct lead inevitably, therefore, to suspicions, however ill-founded, of the "One law for the rich and another for the poor" variety. There are few greater public evils than a distrust of the purity of the administration of justice.

Benches, like the public, are sometimes puzzled and repelled by psychologists. When a judge or a magistrate is informed by a witness that a prisoner should escape the normal punishment of a crime because its commission was due to some cause which appears to ordinary minds to be quite absurd, he begins to doubt the wisdom and the skill of the witness. When he goes on to reflect that this expert witness is called by the prisoner and is paid a fee to give this evidence which seems to him so silly and misleading, he begins to doubt the honesty of the witness. It is but a step further for him to doubt the value of all psychiatry.

It may be thought that this is an exaggeration and that no medical men could be found to give evidence of which the above is a fair criticism. The simple answer is to quote evidence actually given by psychiatrists for the guidance of criminal courts.

At a recent assize a man was convicted of indecent assault upon a young woman. The very experienced judge who tried the case told me that it was a bad and entirely typical case of a brutal young man who was unable to control his lust. To the astonishment of the court a psychiatrist called by the prisoner pleaded in mitigation of punishment that the offence was due not to wickedness but to defective eyesight and that all the prisoner needed was a new pair of spectacles. The judge added to me that

he was so angered by this ridiculous evidence that his entire faith in psychiatrists was shaken.

Mr Claud Mullins is a man of great magisterial experience and a strong believer in the young science. In a recent article he refers to the need for such help in the assessment of punishment. He quotes a case: 'A single woman of forty-seven wrote over a long period letters to various people of the filthiest description. She was sent to prison for twelve months although there was a suspicion of mental derangement. Surely in such a case the judge would have been greatly helped if before he had sentenced this strange woman he had had the benefit of the help of a psychiatrist.' Most of his readers would agree wholeheartedly with Mr Mullins. But perhaps they would not have been so certain if they had heard the trial of a young man of twenty-four about the same date as Mr Mullins' article. The prisoner was convicted of writing disgusting letters over a period of fourteen months to women in the town in which he lived. A psychiatrist called by the defence attributed the prisoner's actions to the fact that he was suffering from diseased tonsils; in place of punishment he recommended the removal of the tonsils.

A boy of sixteen committed an offence by no means uncommon in great cities amongst dirty minded youths. He telephoned from a public call box and spoke indecently to the girl at the exchange. The indecency consisted of asking her coarse questions about her body. He was remanded for a psychological report. The psychiatrist reported that it was an unfortunate case in which the real blame was attributable to the boy's parents. They had, stated the report, foolishly omitted to give the youth proper sex instruction with the result that he was ignorant of the anatomical differences between the sexes and was thus driven to discover the secret for himself by the unfortunate expedient of asking a woman on the telephone. (This nonsense was written by the officially appointed psychiatrist of a remand home.)

The chairman of a juvenile court told me that he asked for a psychological report upon a girl twelve years of age who happened to have bright red hair. The report commenced with the confident assertion that 'This child is mentally and physically unstable, as is shown by the colour of her hair.' Being a man of sense he ignored this

statement, but a year or so later he met the psychiatrist who had furnished it and asked for an explanation. 'Yes,' he said, 'I may well have written that. At that time I was studying the relationship between conduct and pigmentation.' 'Why, what possible relationship can there be?' asked the chairman. 'I found there isn't any,' replied the psychiatrist.

The recent war years were the heyday of psychology. In the selection of soldiers and sailors for promotion to commissioned rank the same attention was paid to the reports of psychiatrists, who in conditions of perfect safety saw candidates for a few days, as to the recommendations of their officers who on active service had had them under their eyes for months. 'The Times' was flooded with letters of protest from schoolmasters who declared that upon psychiatric reports their best boys, whom they had known as heads of houses and prefects, were being refused commissions in H.M. Forces, while boys whose whole school lives had shown them to be morally and intellectually inferior were being commissioned on the *ipse dixit* of the ubiquitous psychologist.

It is no part of my case to attempt to show that the psychiatrist made no useful contribution to the conduct of the war. I have read and heard enough to convince me to the contrary. I am equally convinced that his activities were sometimes harmful. As in the war, so in the field of criminology. There is valuable work for the psychiatrist to do; there is also a good deal of mischief which he may do unless we are careful.

Let me illustrate my meaning. No one who visits a prison to-day can fail to be struck by the attitude of the younger prisoners—men between the ages of eighteen and twenty-five. That most humane of Prison Commissioners, the late Sir Alexander Paterson, once wisely said that there is no sadder sight than the boy who goes to prison crying and comes out laughing. He meant, of course, that the deterrent power of prison had been lost. To-day the really dreadful feature of these young prisoners is that at no period are they either afraid, repentant, or ashamed. So low is their moral standard that they feel nothing beyond an impatient annoyance at having been caught. Dishonesty is the normal rule. So many of their friends have been to prison that they know all about the regime of a

prison life and fully realise in advance that there is nothing of which they need be afraid. They are quite callous of the rights of other people and either ignorant or indifferent to the laws of morality. They feel therefore no vestige of sorrow or shame for evil they have done or suffering they have caused. During the past three or four years it has been my personal experience to find this attitude increasingly obvious amongst young men in prison. My opinion is confirmed by those whose experience is far greater than mine.

Here are some quotations from the reports of the Governors of some Borstal institutions which are printed in the 'Report of the Prison Commissioners' published in December 1947. The Governor of Lowdham Grange institution says: 'I believe that the generation with which we are dealing and will have to deal in the next years has but the faintest conception of what is meant by honesty, truth, and uprightness. Honesty is regarded as outmoded; truth is a virtue only when it cannot be denied; and uprightness is a form of stupidity.' The Governor of Wormwood Scrubs (Boy's Prison) says: 'Few are seriously perturbed by the fact that they have been committed to prison. Their numerous visitors in the main show no embarrassment . . . sympathy rather than blame is the common experience.' The Chaplain of Feltham institution writes: 'In the first place, religion appears to them to be an entirely irrelevant subject. They cannot conceive that it has any important or necessary part to play in their lives. As a consequence they are devoid in the main of any moral sense. Their upbringings and domestic surroundings, their companions and mode of life seem to have produced an entirely selfish philosophy.'

These judgments are in their turn confirmed by the mounting numbers and the increasing gravity of the offences of these young men. Nor can we expect improvement until they—and their families—have ceased to despise discipline and self control and have learnt to pay some heed to the laws of morality and decency. When, if ever, this comes to pass a young criminal will feel regret, remorse, and shame for the suffering he has caused instead of nothing more than the sullen resentment that he now feels because for a few months his liberty to do exactly as he likes from day to day is interfered with. Such a

change of attitude amongst young men of the class and type in question I believe to be essential if their wholesale criminal activities are to be stopped. Unhappily, I feel great anxiety lest in this important, and indeed vital, matter the influence and the reaching of the psychologists may not be opposed to what is wholesome and right.

A healthy society cannot be built upon rotten moral foundations. The greatest need of this country to-day is a general recognition of the difference between right and wrong. There is considerable doubt whether the influence of many psychologists will be exerted in favour of acceptance of normal moral standards. Let me make clear my meaning. I listened recently to a talk by a well-known psychiatrist on his treatment of adolescents who were addicted to certain sex practices. He spoke with complete contempt of the old-fashioned moral approach to such problems, and said that his first move was to remove what he termed the 'guilt sense' and to explain to the boys that there was in fact no question of right or wrong involved. I have heard another psychiatrist—a man with a large practice who holds at least one important hospital appointment—refer to the eradication of the sense of guilt from all young offenders as an essential part of their treatment. A few weeks ago I read a paper written by a psychiatrist on the staff of an institution to which both courts and probation officers send offenders for treatment. He pointed out that many girls in Borstal institutions were very strongly sexed young women of eighteen years of age and upwards who for economic or other reasons found early marriage impossible, and in order to satisfy their desires were led into bad company and so directly into crime. His suggestion, advanced as a remedy for this state of affairs, was the supply of contraceptives to these young women at the public expense together with instruction in their use. At a later stage of his paper when dealing with venereal disease he too spoke of the primary need of removing the guilt sense in order to prevent any undue feeling of embarrassment.

These cases would seem to be deplorable enough, but they are entirely surpassed by one recorded not long ago in one of the medical journals. A man who had been for many years a practising homo-sexual pleaded guilty to a charge of importuning. While on bail he attempted



suicide, but was saved by his mother, for whom he was stated to have a sincere affection. He had originally intended to murder his mother but found himself finally unable to bring himself to do this, though as a preliminary he killed the cat. It was strongly recommended to the court that therapy might help to alleviate his 'anxiety and sense of guilt.' The prisoner was an intelligent bank cashier fully responsible for his actions who had made no apparent attempt to get cured of his disgusting habits until the shock of his arrest. It seems to me entirely proper and beneficial that such a man should have a sense of shame and guilt if he had done nothing worse than cruelly kill a cat. But he had been for years a willing homo-sexual and had planned to kill his own mother. Why in such circumstances it should be right to go to the trouble to assure him that there was nothing for which he need feel ashamed is to me a great mystery.

The examples here given are, it is true, all cases of sex abnormality. I do not know whether or not an offender is told that he need feel no sense of guilt for such crimes as theft. But such a distinction, even if it exists, is far too subtle to be any protection. A young man who is encouraged by the psychiatrist to believe that he should have no sense of guilt when he has broken the moral law in matters of sex is not likely to be persuaded that he need have any such feeling of remorse when he has broken the moral law in other ways.

The courts then are faced with a dilemma. On the one hand, there is the young science of psychiatry making claims that it can cure in cases where all the lessons of experience show beyond argument that mere punitive treatment almost always fails. Moreover, it can support its claims by evidence of undoubted successes. On the other hand, not only do we find psychiatrists guilty of what to ordinary men and women seem to be mere absurdities, but there are clear grounds for the belief that their approach to many cases is in direct conflict with the canons of Christian morality.

How is this dilemma to be solved? The question is not an easy one to answer. Nor is it one to be resolved by the psychiatrist alone or by the lawyer alone. I make no pretence to do more than put forward a number of matters upon which in my opinion discussion would be of value.

In the first place the courts should attempt some serious study of psychiatry with a view to greater uniformity of practice. It cannot be right that the decision as to whether a person convicted of certain offences should go to a nursing home or to prison should depend upon the accident of what judge tries his case.

Considerable advantage might result from the introduction of a system by which an expert psychiatric witness should be called not by the defendant but by the court. Such a system might not be practicable and in any case it would be essential to see that the interests of the defendant were adequately safeguarded—perhaps by allowing the defendant to call a second psychiatrist if he so wished. If the psychiatrist thus became an impartial adviser to the court it would at once obviate what must surely under our existing system be at least a temptation to give incomplete, biased, or exaggerated evidence. It must obviously be difficult for a witness, called and paid for by the defendant, to resist pressure put upon him by the defendant's friends and legal advisers to suppress this damaging fact or to give no more than its real weight to that favourable circumstance. At present, while the psychiatrist remains the witness of one side in the case, it is only human nature that he should incline towards that side. But in my submission his true role should be that of an expert scientific witness to whom questions of guilt and punishment should be incidental. He should recognise that his business is to use his specialised knowledge to point out to the court methods of treatment which he believes might in the particular case be effective. His business is not to go further and to persuade the court in the sole interest of the defendant to adopt those methods. In the decision as to treatment or sentence the interests of the community must always have first place. It is the duty and the responsibility of the court alone to make that decision.

Instances of the sort of evidence of which the suppression or even the toning down by the psychiatrist alters the entire trend of his testimony are not hard to find. Thus, the first essential for successful therapeutic treatment is a desire to be cured. But many offenders have no such desire. They know perfectly well that their habits are wrong and sometimes unpleasant to others but

they get far too much pleasure from their indulgence to wish to be parted from them. Again, in certain cases the chances of a successful cure are about equal whether the defendant is treated by therapy or treated by imprisonment. It is asking a good deal to expect a witness to volunteer to the court, or even to admit, that his own client comes in his opinion into one or other of these categories.

There will probably be general agreement with the suggestion that there should be fuller opportunity than at present exists in all courts for remand to be ordered to obtain for the guidance of the bench skilled psychological advice, especially in cases in which a prisoner is himself unable to bear the cost.

There are other matters more debatable. *Horresco referens* ; but I have heard it said that our existing methods of study for the specialist diploma of this new science are perhaps less than perfect. However, this is not a matter upon which a layman can express an opinion. On the other hand, one may be permitted to ask if there is any real advantage in the use by psychiatrists of the very peculiar phraseology which they employ. A simple example occurs to me. I saw not long ago a report to a bench from the medical officer of a prison. It stated that a prisoner suffered from a severe anxiety neurosis. It transpired that this meant no more than that the man was very much afraid that he would get a long sentence at the assizes.

Those who make exaggerated claims as to what psychology can do in the rehabilitation of delinquents injure not only the interests of justice but the science in which they believe. That in a small residue of cases it can do good when all else fails is surely true. It is, I think, no less true that at the present time some at least amongst its votaries are attempting to advance too fast. It would be a thousand pities if, through lack of caution and restraint, discredit were to come upon a source of learning which properly directed may well bring better justice to our courts and increased happiness to mankind.

LEO PAGE.

## Art. 7.—RELIGION AND POLITICS.

THE religious question in its relation to public affairs has puzzled and disturbed many honest politicians and social reformers. Some have felt compelled to condemn Christianity because of its misinterpretation by unfaithful, though nominally professing, Christians who have exploited the Christian precepts of law and order for the purpose of resisting much needed reforms. Some have gone to the other extreme and claimed that Jesus Christ was a Socialist or even a Communist. In both cases the mixture has been unsatisfactory and unfortunate. Most, perhaps, have shelved the difficulty by persuading themselves that religion and politics cannot be mixed. All have been equally wrong.

As with most modern questions, this one cannot be understood without looking at the historical background. Religion and politics have not always been so strictly separated as they are nowadays. The Church of the Middle Ages had a very strong, indeed a paramount, influence over political as well as personal life. The Common Law of England, now so blurred and indistinct amidst a plethora of statutes, is based entirely on Christian precepts and Old Testament law. Mr Arthur Bryant, in 'English Saga,' writing of a bygone England says :

' Its purpose had been to produce virtuous men and women. It had been rooted in the Christian morality of the medieval Church which, believing that the purpose of life was to save and prepare man's soul for Heaven, taught that worldly laws and institutions should be based as far as possible on the Gospel of Christ. The medieval State—though its practice fell far short of its theory—had therefore condemned usury, forbidden divorce and offences against the family, and endeavoured to fix a "just" level of wages and an "honest" standard of workmanship. It had done so not only to protect the public from greedy egotists but because it was believed that the practice of anti-social activities debased the human soul.'

The Church of the Reformation so long as it retained its evangelical fervour exerted a considerable influence over contemporary affairs. Early Stuart times, however, saw a steady deterioration of faith and zeal until, instead of being a moral arbiter in public affairs, the Established Church

became an instrument of policy in the hands of King and Court. The Church of the Restoration was not only politically but socially partisan, and the support it received from the Tory faction of Charles the Second's day gave it a reputation for political and social bias that it has not yet entirely lost.

The eighteenth-century Church of England persisted in the same sentiments and under the patronage of the upper classes, reinforced by the unfortunate system of private ownership of livings, continued to emphasise class distinctions as well as neglect its duty of moral leadership; and so into the nineteenth century and the industrial revolution.

Meanwhile, the Nonconformist Churches had made considerable progress which had derived great momentum from the work of the Wesleys. Repudiated by the Church of England, their evangelism was generally considered out of place and thoroughly bad form except by a small section of the Church. Their appeal, however, was made to the poor and downcast as well as to the well-to-do and comfortable, and the dissenting Churches came more and more to be the spiritual homes of those who could not be assured of a welcome elsewhere.

' The rich man in his castle,  
The poor man at his gate,  
God made them, high or lowly,  
And ordered their estate,"

admirably summed up the attitude of the Church of England at the beginning of the nineteenth century; and, as Professor Trevelyan reminds us in 'English Social History,'

' God bless the Squire and his relations  
And keep us in our proper stations '

was a sentiment that scarcely aroused comment.

The poor man was, as a matter of fact, reasonably well looked after for so long as he really was at the castle gate enjoying a rural life. But when he emigrated to the town during the industrial revolution, his former means of livelihood having been largely destroyed, he found that the Established Church had very little interest in his deplorable conditions of employment and housing. God, so it

appeared, having ordered his estate had little further concern about his earthly existence ; in fact his hopes of a reasonably tolerable hereafter were often considered to be conditional on his peaceable acceptance of a life of loathsome squalor and endless toil. There were, of course, exceptions, particularly in the small evangelical group within the Church of England, but, generally speaking, the poor and downcast and oppressed found sympathy and comfort only in the Roman Catholic Church and the non-conformist chapels, and it was there that the rapidly developing equalitarian ideas of the nineteenth century found spiritual countenance.

So it came about that the nineteenth century brought about a rigid social and political barrier between the Establishment and nonconformity in addition to the dogmatic differences that already existed. By an odd paradox it was from this very political and social division that the fallacy arose that religion and politics could not be mixed. There were, of course, the secularists who denied *in toto* the authority of religion, but there were also many truly Christian and spiritually minded men and women who so deplored the possibility of political strife being added to the already existing religious and social intolerance between Church and Chapel, that they felt that the only seemly alternative was to keep religion out of public affairs as far as possible.

While the Victorian age was, in a sense, a religious one in which Christianity played a very great part in the daily life and personal practices of a large part of the population, it was also the age in which it became bad form to display too much outward and visible sign of one's inner convictions ; and still worse form to make anything more than an occasional conventional reference to them in a political speech. The proper place for God was in Church, to which one should go once a week to pay one's respects. We may not like realising all this but honest history is never wrong and never out of place. There is far too little of it to-day.

Worse still was to follow. Already rendered torpid and inactive by eighteenth-century latitudinarianism, the nineteenth-century Church of England became tainted with the creed of Humanism—'that view of life which sees in man the source of all meaning and value, instead of in God.' Scientific discoveries gave strong support to the

humanists. 'Science has made God unnecessary,' said a Secularist League manifesto. This was a thesis that the Church, of course, could not accept but it did try to re-interpret God in the light of the latest scientific theories. Only the evangelicals and the Oxford Tractarians stood firm. The modernist teachings gradually took root and have now found lodgment in all the Churches—nonconformist as well as the Church of England. There are vast numbers of clergy of all denominations who avowedly do not believe in the old tenets of Christianity; there are Bishops who deny the validity of the Creeds and who say quite openly that the method of approach to the Gospels should be revised and some of the old beliefs repudiated. With the exception of the Evangelicals and Anglo-Catholics this is a common attitude. When the Churches themselves are hesitant and confused in their beliefs is it surprising that only 10–15 per cent. of the population regularly attend any place of worship? Is it surprising that religion either has no place in politics or is first distorted and then exploited to bolster up political theories? A great part of the nation is to-day rejecting Christian beliefs while deploring the decline of Christian morals. The nineteenth century saw the attempt to imprison in the Churches the Christ of the Gospels with his message of personal salvation; the twentieth century has seen the Churches themselves actively helping to confine Him within the prison-house of scientific theory. Sir Richard Livingstone, in 'Education for a World Adrift,' said:

'The philosophy of life, the standards by which the Victorians and earlier ages were governed, have broken down. We are left with traditions and habits of conduct inherited from them as the earth may for a time still receive light from an extinct star. But that light will not continue to shine, nor can those habits and traditions long survive the beliefs from which they grew. Those who reject Christian beliefs cannot count on keeping Christian morals.'

In the past all our finest and really worth-while national achievements were inspired by Christianity. Most of the great reforms that have changed the course of social history were sponsored by God-fearing statesmen who made a bold confession the basis of their public lives. In our darkest hours it is to the light and inspiration of Christianity that



we turn. Search the pages of the world's history as we will and we can find no alternative faith or philosophy which does not, in its final shape, reduce the individual soul to some form of human bondage and eventually into a creature without faith or liberty or into the victim of some dark superstition. Christianity is the *only* effective alternative to totalitarianism and dictatorship. For if there are two things above all others that Christianity teaches they are first, that fallen humanity is not and never can be self-redemptive and secondly that there is no such thing as a supreme human authority. It is against these beliefs that Communism, Nazism, and Fascism ceaselessly strive.

Few would deny that the outstanding characteristic of modern Europe is the desperate struggle to hold on to Christian ethics while discarding or compromising Christian beliefs—a frantic striving to maintain a code of morals without acknowledging the authority of the Author. That is *the* vital problem of to-day. Beside it all our political, social, and economic problems are insignificant because they are all bound up in the solution of one paramount problem. Never before has national and personal life so abounded with perplexities and fears :

‘ I dreamed, and behold, I saw a man clothed with rags, standing in a certain place, with his face from his own house, a book in his hand, and a great burden on his back. I looked, and saw him open the book and read therein ; and as he read, he wept, and trembled ; and not being able longer to contain, he broke out with a lamentable cry, saying, “ What shall I do ? ” ’

John Bunyan's vision exactly describes us to-day. Politician, industrialist, workman, economist, soldier, statesman, everyone is crying out ‘ What shall I do ? ’ The place and duty of the Churches in politics—all of them—and that means all those who profess and call themselves Christians and not only the clergy, is to answer that question in the only way in which it can ever be satisfactorily answered. The idea that politics and religion cannot be mixed is untenable if our political objectives are to have any spiritual, moral, or ethical value at all. If Christianity fails in this duty the outlook for mankind is indeed a terrifying one.

One thing is clear ; the Churches must not take sides

in party politics. The past association of the Church of England with one side of political life and of the Non-conformist Churches with another has been calamitous. What all the Churches must do is to teach an inflexible religious and moral standard by which all political issues can be judged. It is the lack of such a standard that has thrown our political life into the bewilderment and tumult without which it seems impossible to debate—much less solve—any political issue. If the Churches cannot guide us to such a standard there is little hope that we shall ever reach it.

Scientific materialism teaches that man has no need of personal salvation. The fearful result has been that personal profit has become more important than Christian equity and individual advantage than the interest of the community, and religion has become largely separated from public and business life. This does not apply only to big business, as some would have us think. It applies just as much to the unnecessary strike as to the lock-out; it applies equally to the labourer who does not do a fair day's work as to the employer who exploits his workers. While the Churches must not take sides with one party or another, when the policy of any party or government oversteps the bounds of Christian law it is the duty of the Churches to denounce it from every pulpit in the land and of every Christian to oppose it with all the vigour at his command. Given a clear and determinate standard and the resolution to uphold it there is *no* political, social, or economic issue that cannot be clearly defined as right or wrong. One of the greatest tragedies of modern times has been that so many people calling themselves Christians have become the accomplices of social injustice on the one hand and political intolerance, class warfare, and distortion of public issues on the other.

Before, however, Christians can presume to exert such influence they must be sure of their authority to do so. They have to acknowledge and submit themselves absolutely to the Supreme Authority. They have, once more, to acknowledge the supreme authority of the Bible. Without this the Churches will not be able to reclaim the supreme authority that is theirs if they will fulfil the conditions. 'Here is wisdom; this is the Royal Law; these are the lively oracles of God.' These words from the Coronation

ceremony which accompany the presentation of the Bible to the King have lost most of their significance to-day. There is an appalling and increasing ignorance of the Bible and the once common practice of Bible reading has dwindled to distressingly small proportions. This arises directly from our failure to take up the challenge of materialism. The arbitrary and constantly changing rulings of science have been admitted until the modern churchgoer does not know which parts of the Bible are fact and which are fancy. The average man in the street has consequently taken the not unreasonable course of disregarding the whole Book.

Until the Churches once more accept the Bible as the inspired guidance of God, they will not be able to speak with *the* supreme authority and they will not recover that inspiration that enabled the prophets of old to say 'Thus saith the Lord.'

Secondly, we must relate once more the whole of Christian teaching to the essential of personal salvation. It is only on the personal relationship of individual man with his God that the Christian State can be founded. A merely ethical creed, however admirable, is worthless by itself because it does not provide the power to keep it. It is with regard to personal salvation that the New Testament is clear beyond any argument and it is here that an unbridgeable gulf exists between modernist teaching and Christianity. If the Bible story of the fall of man is rejected, the doctrines of the Atonement and personal salvation become nonsense. Practically the whole of the New Testament becomes sheer rubbish. Can any intelligent man suggest that Christ came to die for the salvation of a race that is getting better and better by some mysterious evolutionary process? If there was no fall there is no need for atonement. Christianity, if it is to redeem the world, must stand by the whole Bible. If one part is removed the whole structure collapses, and becomes a series of conjectures rather than a rock of authority.

The materialist may shrug his shoulders at all this, but what is the result of his ethics and his materialism and his self-sufficiency? We have only to look around us to see the decline in moral standards, the relaxing of family life, the steady undermining of the sense of duty and responsibility, the idea of man as a responsible being fast disappearing, and a rapid decline into an age without standards.

There is another side to the picture, however. An increasing number of people will agree that there is a need for spiritual revival. Many people will agree that without the intervention of spiritual forces the world faces cataclysm. In spite of all the adverse influences men and women have shown in a marked degree many of the fundamental virtues, especially during the war. Sweeping advances in social and political reform have had their inspiration in Christianity. While formal religion has seldom been more dead, the spiritual eagerness of search of millions has seldom been more desperately eager. Never has the answer of materialism been more unsatisfactory or dejecting.

This, then, is the connection between religion and politics; a combination of Christian men and women, convinced of their authority, determined to advocate a return to God's laws as the only basis for public policy and resolved to judge all political issues by the standards of these laws; a recognition that God's laws provide a solution for every social, economic, or political problem. Obvious offences against society or against the accepted ethics of civilisation are condemned by most people because they offend against some particular political or economic code. There are many things, however, that one seldom hears condemned, even in Church, as offences against the law of God. Most of us regard every social or economic problem in terms of a military political or economic solution only. The result is always failure. A million men and women determined to oppose any measure, initiated by whichever political party or interest, which was not in accordance with God's clearly stated laws, could change the face of England and profoundly influence the future course of history. Nor should Christian political action be only negative. Such a body of Christian influence should be active in the making of positive plans to overcome the apparently insuperable difficulties with which we are faced. Thus the Christian people of this land can teach the reality and sufficiency of the Christian Faith as the only alternative to a world ruled by the frail and vacillating forces of physical law and economic necessity.

JOHN de COURCY.

## Art. 8.—CONCERNING ENGLISH OAK AND TIMBER.

*(Memoranda and diary notes on oak, firewood, 'timber,' and some other matters.)*

SOME of the oak being carved for the new House of Commons is described as having come 'from 300-year-old trees, grown in woods in Herefordshire and Shropshire.' Two years ago there were photographs of oaks being felled at Whiligh near Tunbridge Wells for the repair of Westminster Hall, but the trees seemed to be in a field or park. (Incidentally, the late A. L. Howard noted that the Clerk of the Works to the House of Commons counted more than 500 annual rings in a squared beam—heartwood only—used for the restoration of Westminster Hall roof.) I have a memorandum, without context or reference, noting that the largest beams in St Paul's Cathedral came from Sherwood, and that Wren's letter of specification is still extant; the beams were to be 47 feet long, 13 and 14 inches at the small end, 'of growing timber, and as near as can be without sap.'

Foresters will be pleased to know that the timber for the new House was grown in woods, for it is a part of forestry to produce good crops of fine knot-free timber by growing trees in close association, to make height and to discourage low branches. But even in woods our oak seems to have too little height and too much spread, which may most usually be explained by cultivation on the coppice-with-standards system. Professor A. G. Tansley and others have suggested that this method of growing oak originated in the sixteenth century, when laws were passed requiring that, where woodland was being felled, at least twelve standard trees per acre should be spared. This wide spacing permitted trees to spread and to make those crooked timbers which the shipbuilders required. Beneath and between the trees there were light and room enough for some such secondary crop as hazel coppice, to be cut on a rotation between six and twelve years to provide material for wattle, peasticks, and other needs.

Since 1862 we have not required the same kind of oak for shipbuilding: for most purposes, straight, knot-free timber is needed—and the longer the better. A full mature crop of oak should number not twelve to twenty trees an

acre but something like 50 or 60. And if the soil and site are favourable, oak should be fit to fell before it is 200 years old, though there may be exceptional places (such as the famous Spessart forest in Bavaria) where selected trees have been spared to an age of 400 years.

The relatively slow growth of oak\* would mean some time-lag in the adjustment of a silvicultural system to new needs even if most land-owners had a lively forest sense (which they have not) and no bias towards inertia. As things are, much oak has been and is still being grown as though the needs of 1960 and 2000 would be the same as 1560 and 1600.

Now, various writers have remarked (for instance, Miss Brenda Colvin in her recent 'Land and Landscape') that the quantities of oak deliberately planted in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries were not used for the purpose for which they were intended—that is, ship-building. And hostile critics of modern forestry (whether of conifer plantations or the longer-term oak) sometimes say that no one can foretell what timber we shall need 50, 100, or 200 years hence. I think this is true. A guess is the best that can be offered. But suppose we did not make even a guess, and took the line 'We can't foretell more than twenty years at most, so we'll grow nothing but peasticks and cricket bats.' Would that be wise?

How extremely bad is most of the oak aged between 100 and 400 years, still standing in England! And this is quite apart from the fact that the trees were intended to grow timber other than what we now need. Oak is an exacting species, and though the trees will survive starvation and many afflictions, they will not make good timber just anywhere. That was known to some people when the oak was planted, as two citations by Albion in 'Forests and Sea Power' indicate. In 1696 the Navy Board reported:

'Gravelly and Rocky high Grounds no more than marshy low and very wett Grounds seldom produce good Timber—the one being too cold and barren brings trees of no great Stature and most times shaken from want of Root—the other

---

\* Some authorities object to the description of oak as slow, but it is undoubtedly the slowest of important forest trees in Britain. Average heights of 40–45 feet in forty years would rank as good, and thereafter height growth tends to be slower.

produces trees quick in Growth, free in Substance, spungy, slender and tall, and very little compass among it.'

And in 1788 the Commissioners of Land Revenue noted :

'The oak, to become great timber, required the strongest and deepest soil, which being also the most profitable for agriculture, is the least likely to be employed by individuals in raising timber.'

(The reminder of the former corn versus oak competition for good land is interesting in these days of sheep versus conifers competition for many highlands in England, Wales, and Scotland.)

Yet oak was planted in situations where it was doomed from the outset to be third-rate or worse. There are still growing, not only in the Forest of Dean and the New Forest but over most of the country, memorials to the lamentable mistakes of our forbears. Do people know that the United Kingdom, with relatively the smallest forest area of any country in Europe, has to this day (after two great timber-consuming wars) a surplus of low-grade oak ?

Sometimes when I read affectionate or admiring accounts of a patriotic squire or retired admiral who habitually filled his pockets with acorns, to be planted on his country walks, another aspect of the question comes to mind. How careful were these worthy gentlemen about selecting the acorns to be planted ? Were they sufficiently fastidious about provenance or parentage ? To criticise, even by questioning implication, the men who planted acorns while their fellows were drinking or gambling must seem hard and ungrateful but the point is important—and to-day's planters might keep it in mind. (If a farmer sows a bad strain of wheat, one year's crop suffers. If a forester sows a bad strain of oak, 150–200 years' crop suffers.)

Another question of special contemporary interest is, Which oak ? The pedunculate species is much the commoner and was the more used in the past, but it is also the more exacting in its requirements. From much of the ground which might be ranked as marginal for oak, better crops might be obtained by planting the sessile species, which is naturally dominant on some of the poorer land over the older Silurian rocks in the Welsh Marches and



Wales. The sessile oak tends to be smaller and perhaps slightly slower in growth but it is also more straight and less branchy in habit.

Out-of-date aims, unsuitable sites, perhaps poor seed or even the wrong species ; to these reasons for England's poor oak another of great importance must be added. Many woodland owners, when in need of money, have sold timber, and in too many places the timber-buyers have been allowed to select the better trees for felling and to leave the worse. The principle is palpably bad, but if a man wants money urgently and cares little for silviculture, why should he trouble ? Certainly the State has hitherto done nothing to encourage a more provident policy, and owners have been able to console themselves with the reflection that the poorer trees which are left are just as good as the best for pheasants and foxes, either of which has counted for more than forestry on most English estates for the last 100 years.

'And now,' says a visitor to the woods, 'surely that is enough about the mistakes made in the past. What are you doing about oak to-day ? The inquiry may well cause some heart-searching, especially since the papers again report that the repair of railway wagons is being delayed for lack of the required oak scantlings.

First, I should think very little unsuitable ground is planted with oak to-day. It is a negative claim, and oak-lovers may retort that little ground of any kind is being planted with oak. *Touché*. But most of the land allotted to the State forests is poor and unfit for oak, and private owners cannot be blamed if they have planted little in this present century of increasing taxation and decreasing security of tenure. But the Forestry Commission has, on its better ground, some excellent stands of young oak, including examples of both natural regeneration and artificial plantation. And now, when there is a dedication scheme, and the time has come to replant some of the better situated private woodlands that were clear-felled between 1939 and 1945, oak may be remembered.

Seed ? Genetics is a difficult subject, outside a woodman's province. Even those who know most seem to be chiefly conscious of their ignorance. But stories of haphazard seed collection do circulate, and there are moments when a man wonders whether the provenance of the seed

for this crop of 150-200 years is considered, even to-day, as carefully as it should be.

Sylvicultural methods? Technicalities would be for the most part out of place here, but two or three points observable by any intelligent person walking in the country may be noted. Our island is dotted with pine plantations which began as plantations of oak, nursed by pines. The small, slower-growing oaks were overlaid, smothered or throttled by the quicker-growing pine nurses—because woodmen did not cut them out when their preliminary protective function was accomplished. I think the lesson has been widely learnt, and that particular mistake is relatively uncommon to-day. But the later care of oak seems to need watching; we have no tradition of sound forestry, and most of our oak has been grown either (as already described) on the out-of-date coppice-with-standards system, or entirely without system. (It is significant that there are no yield tables for oak grown in this island, so British foresters have no such criteria as exist for French and German territories, where generations of skilled men have produced the finest oak, fit for cleaving to make wine casks.) Continental foresters do not expect to obtain first-class timber from pure oak plantations. They recognise that prime oak must nearly always be mixed with other species. At some ages the secondary species may be almost level with the oak, as is suggested by such a saying as 'Oak likes to grow in a fur coat but with his head uncovered.' Later, the secondary species will probably be an underplanting, forming a second storey in the forest. Oak itself is a light-demander, but any trees used for underplanting must be shade-tolerant. Hitherto, beech and hornbeam have been the chief favourites on the Continent but some of the 'newer' North American trees offer possibilities, particularly western red cedar (*Thuja plicata*) and western hemlock (*Tsuga heterophylla*). I have read accounts of *Thuja plicata* having been used in England with success (the shape of the trees specially fits them to provide oak with a fur coat while leaving the crown free) and I have of course seen oak underplanted with beech, but in too many places English oak aged between 25 and 125 years grows pure. Sir Oracle Woodman? No, merely a personal, non-expert opinion. If first-class oak can be grown pure, well and good, and the general implica-

tions above will be proved at fault. Someone should know by the year 2100.

Perhaps enough has been said to suggest that, though occasional fine oak trees, yielding prime timber, may 'happen' by luck, the growing of good crops of oak is a difficult business which can be achieved only by the exercise of skill on choice land. Foresters' appreciation of conifers does not blind them to the delights of oak, and every forester who can show good oak is proud to do so. But the 'show stands' will nearly all be young. The other day I wrote to ask a forester of great experience (his work has taken him into every county of England and Wales, and through most of Scotland) to suggest where I could make a photograph of really good mature oak, comparable with that grown on the Continent. He replied that, in the whole of this island, he could recall only one stand of mature oak\* that gladdened his forester's heart. Let us hope that no experienced forester will be able to make such a remark 150 years hence.

Oak coppice, of which this country has innumerable small patches (the majority neglected), must not be confused with the oak of high forest, composed of tall timber-producing trees. Indeed, oak coppice leads naturally from timber to firewood. The most valuable product of oak coppice, which was normally cut on a rotation of over fifteen and under thirty years, was tan-bark; and the stems from which the bark had been stripped might in some places make pitprops or fencing stakes but the bulk went for charcoal or firewood. Now, cheaper tanning materials are obtainable from abroad, and in Britain firewood no longer counts as a major forest product. The woodlands could not make the same contribution to heating a population of over 45,000,000 that they once made to heating a population of under 5,000,000. Yet the subject merits a glance, for most people like wood fires, and some of the historical/geographical aspects are interesting.

First, fuel is still the chief use of wood, considered on a world basis, and authorities estimate that Man's consumption of wood is as eight (for fuel) is to seven (for all other uses put together). Outside Britain wood is still grown systematically for fuel. Good examples may be found

---

\* This was on the Rufford estate, near Worksop.

in France, where it is computed that more than three-quarters of the wood from privately-owned oak coppice is still used for fuel, despite the demand for vine stakes, and in parts of India, where the lack of wood or other fuel led to impoverishment of the soil, which the peasants robbed of dung—collected for use as fuel. Again, at the Imperial Forestry Conference last summer the establishment of plantations in the Sudan on purpose to make firewood was mentioned.

In bygone days firewood was likewise specially grown in Britain, because the woodland by-products or waste did not provide enough. The usual method was to coppice or to pollard trees—and pollarding is much the same as coppicing, a similiar result being achieved by cutting a tree at eight feet from the ground instead of four inches. The idea is well set forth in 'The Art of Husbandrie' of 1523 :

' If a tree be heeded and used to be topped and cropped at everye xii or xvi yeres ender or thereabout it will beare moche more woode by processe of tyme than if it were not cropped and more profyte to the owner.'

In Tudor times a great scarcity of firewood developed in many areas, as the forests diminished under the demands for constructional timber and industrial fuel. Dr W. G. Hoskins has noted how some wills of the period indicate that the firewood in the yard might be worth more than all the furniture in the house. In the more fortunate localities estovers included firewood from the forests, and 'the common of estovers' was jealously guarded, for there were many counties whither 'sea-cole,' which was being increasingly used, could not be brought by water. Hence the development of sylvicultural systems, such as that recommended in 'The Art of Husbandrie,' to provide fuel. The country still has patches of woodland composed of trees first pollarded three or four centuries ago so that they might be lopped regularly for fuel ; the most famous examples are Burnham Beeches and the hornbeams in Epping Forest. (Incidentally, if two or three people in Loughton had not insisted in the eighteen-seventies on their continuing right to lop, secured in 'the common of estovers,' Epping Forest might not have been preserved as a forest.)

To-day a curious situation has developed. Though any firewood is for most purposes an inferior fuel to coal, it is yet in keen demand. That much everyone knows. Less well-known is the existence of masses of unused firewood throughout large areas: derelict oak coppice, over-mature or dotard trees with little or no sound timber in them, elms killed or half-killed by disease—these are only three of the most obvious categories. The missing link is labour, organised or unorganised, to convert (at an economic figure) the dead wood into firewood, and take it to those who would buy it.

A woodman, observing the numbers of trees which will never make good timber, and hearing the prices which people will pay for firewood, may be forgiven for thinking that this is the perfect opportunity to clear some of the rubbish from the woods and hedgerows; but in fact relatively little is being done, and there is an irony in the recollection that 150 years ago a writer put forward the increasing use of coal (not, as now, the scarcity of coal and the increased demand for firewood) as an argument for ridding the country of both dead wood and wood that ought to be dead.

'At present, faggots are of decreasing value in London: owing, I understand, to the bakers having found it cheaper to heat their ovens with coals than with faggot wood, above a certain price: a circumstance, which may tend to clear away the pollards and hedge borders, which, at present, disgrace the county.'

In the present situation a man may do what lies within his power on his own land, but for the rest he can only shrug his shoulders and observe that people ought at least to know both the opportunities and the apparent impasse. It may perhaps be added that if individual people fail to do what may lie within their limited power, the arguments of those who believe in State action are fortified. (The larger aspects of British forestry provide an interesting example of how men who are by nature opposed to State interference may feel themselves forced into keen support of nationalisation or semi-nationalisation measures, through despair of any effective move from private persons.)

'... the pollards and hedge borders, which, at present, disgrace the county.' I should like for a moment to turn back to those words written in 1799 by Marshall in his

'Sketch of the Vale of London and an Outline of its Rural Economy.' Few people but woodmen and foresters would to-day accept the implications. While neglecting sylviculture, we English have developed, where trees and woods are concerned, a cult of romantic untidiness, within which we most of us find our criteria of arboreal and sylvan beauty. I think the connection between the neglect or rarity of good forestry (together with the maintenance of such systems as coppice-with-standards) and the popular taste is worth stressing. The majority of people derive their ideas of 'what a forest should look like' or 'what I mean by a beautiful wood' from such places as Epping Forest, Burnham Beeches, and the thousand and one mixed woods throughout the country—woods so neglected or ill-managed from a forestry point of view that they carry barely a quarter of the timber crop they should. This is neither to question the propriety of keeping certain amenity woodlands (such as Epping and Burnham) as they are, nor to deny that they are beautiful, but merely to emphasise that one of the psychological effects of such woods is to make thoughtless and ignorant people apathetic or hostile to good forestry. (It is scarcely necessary to recall how great a proportion of our population is now urban, or how Horace Plunkett repeatedly warned that 'the urban mind is our greatest enemy.')

Among the very few non-professional supporters which foresters and woodmen have for their own view that well-grown forest trees are beautiful was the famous author of 'The English Flower Garden.' William Robinson wrote :

'In much of the southern counties the oak, our best native tree, is badly grown—thinly set in underwood, and as a roadside or single tree in pasture land or park. My own oaks often wasted their strength and their beauty growing all branches, tortuous and covering far too much of the wood. When cut down, they were not a third of the value of rightly grown oaks. . . . The right way of growing the oak we may see in the noble forests of France, like Marly or Bercy, with stems like monuments, and these with top branches too, though not half of what our spreading oak bears. Such oaks (as ours) are picturesque and give welcome shade ; but for me the palm of beauty goes to the tree with fifty or more feet of clear stem.'

Those words were quoted a few years ago by a well-known writer, a man of widespread country knowledge and

sympathies, to serve as a peg for a comment that might have come from a townsman who had never devoted three minutes to looking at one tree: 'Well, that is without doubt a noble tree, but it is not an English oak. My own preference is for a tree grown under natural conditions, not the forester's, which are for conditions of use as timber.'

*De gustibus non est disputandum*, yet we continue disputing, and since the award of the palm of beauty to an oak well grown for use as timber has been contested, I must quote Mr Norman Douglas: There is a beauty in fitness which no art can enhance. Once again I maintain that the pillared aisles of a well-tended forest are as beautiful as any wild wood, though in a different way, and if anyone uses that fantastic word 'unnatural,' I would recall that Man's making of forests for his use is no more 'unnatural' than the rabbit's making of holes for their use.

And so back to oak and timber again. The authors of forestry books are inclined to be modest about defining 'timber' and there is nowhere any indecent competition to determine the meaning of this word which appears on every other page. Schlich's reference to 'timber and firewood' merely implies that firewood is not timber—rather a negative advance towards knowledge.

The New English Dictionary is more helpful. The inquirer is told, before he comes to definitions, that 'timber' derives from the same root as 'dome' (and of course domicile, domestic and the like), with the Greek verb *δέμειν* to build, in the common ancestry. Timber means: (1) A building, structure, edifice, house; (2) Building material generally; (3) . . . ; (4) . . . to (4b) 'Trees growing upon land, and forming part of the freehold inheritance: embracing generally the oak, ash, and elm of the age of twenty years or more'—together locally with other trees, such as birch in Yorkshire and beech in Buckinghamshire.

Now this last definition of timber (which still holds good in law when the word appears in leases) should be of particular interest to others than woodmen. The three generally recognised timbers (all hardwoods) were the chief building materials for houses, ships, bridges, and wagons. Of the three, oak was supreme, and great quantities were required. (A large seventeenth-century house might contain about 6,000 cubic feet of timber or



the produce of perhaps 120 mature oaks. A ship-of-the-line might contain as much as 3,200 loads; as a load was about 50 cubic feet, this meant that such a large ship, comprising about 160,000 cubic feet of timber, might have cost the forests fully 3,000 average trees.\* Within more recent times the railways have been among the heaviest consumers of oak; some French forests suffered in the nineteenth century to provide oak for railway construction.)

Though other 'utilisations' have been developed, building or construction of one kind or another remain to this day among the major employments of wood. The momentary use of the word 'wood' instead of 'timber' may sound suspicious or ominous. In fact, by 1938, the United Kingdom's consumption was divided between 6 per cent. hardwoods (from oak and other broad-leaved trees) and 94 per cent. softwoods (from conifers). As those are timber consumption figures, it may seem unnecessary to note that the meaning of the word 'timber,' even if restricted to building materials, has evidently changed. Yet the change does deserve to be remarked. Whenever one of the futile conifers versus broad-leaves arguments develops, the foresters and woodmen find themselves on one side, with 'the Rest' ranged (and raging) on the other, forgetful that the consumers display this 94 to 6 preference for the produce of conifers. Clearly the nigger in this woodpile is not the woodman or forester or even the Forestry Commission.

Certain facts about some of the trees which make 'timber' in its new connotation also deserve to be more widely known. Several—those of Western North America for example—had not even been discovered when the older meaning of timber was being formulated, and there is a possibility that they may revolutionise timber production in the future. C. P. Ackers has written:

'We now have standing in Great Britain two Douglas firs . . . which must contain nearly 1,000 cubic feet of timber: both these trees are approximately 100 years old, yet it takes

---

\* Though a fine forest-grown oak may yield 300 cubic feet, the shorter, more 'natural' trees felled between the years 1500 and 1800 are estimated to have yielded on average only 50-60 cubic feet. The disparity makes a good incidental illustration of the aims and achievement of scientific forestry.

a fine oak tree to come to this volume of timber in 500 years.\* We have young stands of *Abies grandis* and *Tsuga heterophylla* in Scotland, far heavier for their age than any other stands of trees we have previously grown; we have at Leighton in Montgomery a stand of *Sequoia* (redwood) which is probably the heaviest stand of any tree in the country, yet it is well under 100 years of age.'

Of the *Sequoias* in their native California H. L. Edlin has observed that 'a single stem may contain 30,000 cubic feet of timber—more than is usually found on five acres of a good coniferous plantation.'

In this year of 1948, when California is remembering the events of 1848–49, the two species of *Sequoia* (found by gold-seekers or as a result of exploration for gold) must be allowed particular mention. Incidentally, two other well-known Californian trees, *Pinus radiata* and *Cupressus macrocarpa* (which latter dies in hundreds in our gardens and round our tennis lawns every severe winter) were found farther south a decade or so before the great gold rush. They are interesting examples of species which have flourished far better in other countries than in their native place. It would be rash to suggest that the redwoods in Britain and elsewhere will similarly outstrip their Californian parents (the species was not declining when found, as *P. radiata* and *C. macrocarpa* were) yet there is at least this possibility—the possibility of trees in Britain exceeding a height of 350 feet and a timber content of 30,000 cubic feet.

I do not wish to begin here one of the above-mentioned futile arguments (I am all for growing oak, beech, and ash where good oak, beech, and ash can be grown) but surely these points are worth noting? There are other reasons than speed of growth and quick financial returns for planting conifers—some of which are by no means short-lived 'trees of a day.'

And might not the change in the connotation of the word 'timber' be roughly correlated with yet other changes, such as the change in the size of the known world, or the world settled by white men, the changes in population and in transport? *Pinus radiata* is especially remarkable for its quick growth in South Africa, Australia,

---

\* I myself have never seen an oak tree that contained nearly 1,000 cubic feet of timber.—J. D. U. W.

and New Zealand, where it makes the timber required for butter-boxes and packing cases for other food exports. These timber needs did not exist when timber's earlier meaning was generally current, and this country had a population of about 5,000,000 to be compared with to-day's of about 45,000,000.

Oak and firewood and the meaning of 'timber' (yes, and of 'forest' itself, once the wild unenclosed hunting grounds of the king and now a territory devoted to growing timber even as certain fields grow wheat)—all these topics have within them the common factor of change. Nobody can appreciate our forests and woodlands without appreciating the changes from the past to the present, and almost certainly from the present to the future, and the reasons for these changes. Accordingly, I would plead for more awareness of the woods and forests as living and changing parts of the country, and for the development of that spirit which eighteenth-century naturalists sometimes suggested in such a phrase as 'A curious and inquiring gentleman has observed . . .' Little or nothing can be expected of the majority, devoted now as ever to bread and circuses (*alias* wages and working hours), but surely the minority of the reputed intelligentsia might develop a little more real intelligence and sympathy in place of the apathy and hostility indicated by such comments as 'All forests look alike' and 'Britain is planting too many trees'?

It is less a question of ignorance (as Will Rogers has well said, 'Everybody is ignorant, only on different subjects') than of an unintelligent and unjustly prejudiced approach. With very rare exceptions people do not look at woods and forests curiously. Many will pass through an oak plantation without noticing that it is oak, and most will fail to observe whether it seems to be doing well or whether it is underplanted or not. Again, people who would never dream of suggesting that a farmer ought to have thistles and poppies in his cornfields will object if woodmen have cleaned thorns and honeysuckle from their woods. How much better it would be—and how much more interesting for people themselves—if they came to a wood with such thoughts as 'I wonder what is being grown here? How old are these trees? When will they be mature? What is their destiny? Are they

impoverishing or improving the ground in which they grow? 'Yet in real life the woods remain for most adults, even of the educated classes, exactly what they are to young children: game preserves, retreats, or playgrounds, and nothing more.

When a woodman hears one of the all-too-familiar complaints against 'alien trees' he groans in spirit. (Yet once more, Does the insular speaker know that the Norway spruce or Christmas tree was here before the Ice Ages but is not an indigenous tree because our islands became separated from the Continent before the country had been fully 're-vegetated' after the recession of the ice? And fossils prove that the already mentioned *Sequoias*, together with some other American trees, flourished in our land at a yet more distant period. Is the speaker quite sure as to which trees are aliens even by his own short-term standards? Lombardy poplars, now to be ranked among our most familiar and distinctive trees—though almost useless as timber—were first planted in England barely 200 years ago. Larch has been a common tree in Scotland for less than 200 years, and in England for less than 150 years. Queen Elizabeth never saw a larch or a cedar of Lebanon, and it is unlikely that she ever saw a horse chestnut in bloom.)

I have again turned to look back, but it were better to look forward. While retaining such relics as Burnham Beeches and the old oaks at Bilhagh (fragments of ancient forest which it would be a crime to destroy) intelligent people should yet be aware that these are silvicultural museums. The forest of to-day and to-morrow must be entirely different. And lest anyone should mistakenly find here an implied or veiled plea for the replacement of beech and oak by conifers, I will conclude by recalling that this country has not been growing enough beech for her women's shoe heels, enough ash for lifeboat oars, or enough prime oak for her beer barrels. That recollection may serve to poultice any pride in museum woodlands.

J. D. U. WARD.

Art. 9.—HUNGARY, FORMERLY, YESTERDAY, AND  
TO-DAY.

ON such a subject, at such a time, one may be tempted to stray into the pleasant (if deserted) paths of History. And I trust that straying will not be too far and too long. One cannot help thinking, a little, of the memorable past of a noble and gallant nation, now fallen on evil days and into enemy hands. One recalls great and famous figures like John Hunyadi—Hunyadi Janos—and his son Matthias 'Corvinus,' under whom the Magyars fought in the van of Christendom against the Turks, and stood in the van of European civilisation, with a sovereign and a court of exceptional culture. For that culture-centre was indeed exceptional, even in the earlier enthusiasm of the Revival of Learning. And it was able to exist, and to develop, shining like a star in the Europe of those days, because Hungarians stood in the breach against Turkish barbarism, so manfully, and so effectively, during all the fifteenth century, and the last years of the fourteenth. John Hunyadi's victory at Belgrade, in 1456, over the troops of Mahomet II, the Conqueror of Stambul ('One God in Heaven and One Lord on Earth') was a representative and typical feat of heroism, strategy, and tactics.

And again, it is more than tempting to recall how the Magyars, once freed from Turkish bondage in the days of our William of Orange, of Marlborough, and of Prince Eugene, showed afresh their old virility, energy, and capacity for government and civilised progress. And how in 1848-50, by their brilliantly unsuccessful struggle for complete independence from Austria, they attracted so deep and vehement a sympathy in this country. For might they not possibly have won that great day, if Russian arms had not been thrown into the scale? And was not Russia—under the autocracy of the first Nicolas—the special aversion both of Englishmen and of Hungarians?

Bitterly did that Tsar Nicolas regret his action. 'That was the other imbecile who saved Vienna,' he is said to have exclaimed at the tomb of John Sobieski. But the whole incident was typical of the intense antagonism between St Petersburg—or Moscow—and Budapest.

Once more, after the Magyars, twenty years later, in 1867, had finally gained complete Home Rule, thanks

to Bismarck and Moltke, to the Seven Weeks War of 1866, to the statesmanlike moderation of Kaiser Franz Josef, and above all to their own political genius and persistence—was not the civilised world impressed by their capacity?

Almost by general consent, inside and outside Hungary, the half century from 1867 to 1914 was for Magyars, as for Germans, a prosperous and memorable time, one of the brightest in their history. For the *Magyar-Ország*, enjoying self-government, though within the realm of the Habsburg Emperor (who now became Hungarian king and successor of St Stephen) increasingly dominated politics in the Dual Monarchy. More and more, in fact, it now stood out as a primary core, a chief centre, of that monarchy of Austria-Hungary or Hungary-Austria. And the Austrian Kaiser, a man of some wisdom, recognised this. Not merely at Vienna, but also, and still more vitally, at Budapest, was the capital of that composite realm.

But in 1914–20 all prosperity and progress were cruelly interrupted, first by a war of life and death, and then by a peace of crushing defeat and dismemberment. Hungary now suffered staggering losses in territory, in population, and in economic resources. And, at the present moment, and from the end of the Second World War, again finally calamitous, both for Magyars and for Germans, Hungary once more lies prostrate. For her, indisputably, the last state is even worse than the first. These years of the new subjugation, a subjugation to Soviet Russia and her Communism (1945–48), represent an even more complete tragedy than the days after Trianon—when Admiral Horthy was, at any rate, able to break down the Bolshevism of Bela Kun (or Adalbert Kohen?). For now the situation is quite different. The Hungarian Communism of those days had to fend for itself. Now it rests, and has rested since 1945, on the irresistible power of the Russian armies.

Yet, throughout their history in Europe (and it is fundamentally true to-day) this Magyar race, this leading and lordly branch of the Ugro-Finnish stock, has been, naturally and nationally, antagonistic to the Slavs. Historically it thrust itself, as a conqueror and supplanter, into the Western regions of ninth- and tenth-century Slavdom, splitting that Western Slavdom into two,

Northern and Southern. The Rumanians prolonged that wedge of division to the Euxine.

In their later history, till yesterday, the Hungarian people have been especially opponents of Russian influence. Bitter indeed is the irony of the present position.

That present position, of course, starts from and depends upon the dominating fact of Russian conquest. Upon that rock has rapidly grown the fungus of a local, all-controlling, Russian-sponsored, Communist Party.

In ten months, writes M. Francis Nagy, the exiled Prime Minister of Hungary, in an article of last September, 'I saw my country conquered from within' by an insignificant minority of Communists. This minority was led, and guided, by a small group of men trained and directed by the Soviet authorities. Most of this group had long resided in Russia. Some of them had become Soviet citizens and even officials. The most important of them was himself a link with the days, the party, and the measures, of Bela Kun.

With no undue delay the Russians—having mastered the capital and flooded Central Hungary with their troops—seized tens of thousands of Magyars, and others, and drafted them off to imprisonment and hard labour in Soviet territories. And these captives, it is said, like the war-prisoners of earlier months, were used as levers to influence and guide, to persuade and terrorise, much wider sections of the Hungarian people. The names and addresses of the relatives of such deportees, prisoners, and hostages, M. Nagy tells us, were constantly supplied to the Communist organisation in Hungary itself. A Communist agent might then approach such relatives and suggest that the son, brother, or father, in exile in Russian hands, might be ransomed and restored to his family, through a complaisant attitude of that family towards Communism. Thus Bolshevik Russia and its sympathisers could acquire a powerful, usually secret, hold over a multitude of people, in that Central Danube plain, absolutely devoid of real Communist leanings, and inheriting all the deep Magyar distrust, fear, and aversion as to Russia, as to Bolshevism, and as to Slavdom.

In the Allied Control Commission, a most important legacy of the war, by a rash arrangement of January 1945, the Soviet High Command was given, locally, a presiding



and directing power. And in the following August, by the Potsdam Agreement, Russia was granted possession of German assets and 'enterprises' in Hungary—a right which became one of the chief instruments in obtaining a domination of the economy of Magyar-land.

Moreover, by the development of the local Communist party, and the decisive extension of its influence, Bolshevik Russia might well hope to render harmless the Allied promises to the conquered people of freedom to create 'democratic institutions of their own choice.' This guarantee—though repeatedly given, as at Yalta, in February 1945—might be, and was, effectively 'sovietised' by a complete local victory of Communism.

And so, likewise, the provision of the Hungarian Peace Treaty for the withdrawal of the Russian troops, and the restoration of full independence, ninety days after the ratification of that Treaty—'to which we looked forward as to a long-delayed Dawn'—need not be such a blow to Russian influence after all. For, with the Communists in firm control of Hungary, within, Russian armies, without, had abundant facilities of re-entry and re-conquest.

With Communism in firm control—we must assume. Yet the elections of 1945 scarcely gave these disciples of Moscow a complete mandate to cut and to carve, 'to pull down, to build, and to plant.' The independent patriot party of *Small-holders*—itself very democratic, by the way—polled 57 per cent. of the votes. (If we join, as many joined in their estimates, the *National Peasant Party* to the *Small-holders*, we get 64 per cent.) The Communists had 17 per cent.

Now, however, the Bolsheviks from the East set their pupils of the Danube Plain vigorously to work to redress this unsatisfactory state of things. And under the ægis of the Hammer and Sickle, and on the surface of things, this was done. A striking picture is painted by M. Nagy and others of the gradual, yet rapid, subjugation of the Political Party Front by the Hungarian Communists, powerless without the military conqueror, still in occupation, but strong enough under his protection, and inspired by his ruthlessness. (Yet, when all is said and done, we must not forget that this marvellous change is mainly, as I have suggested, in appearance. In reality, to this day, both the masses and the classes of the Magyar people,

at home or in exile, are probably as resolutely hostile to Communism as ever.) By endless devices of secret and open pressure, and especially by accusations of 'conspiracy'; by incessant discovery of 'plots'—real, feigned, forged, or other; by the extortion of 'confessions,' often repudiated afterwards; and by what sometimes apparently amounted to the torture of witnesses, much progress was made. Many a device of modern scientific cruelty seems to have been employed against certain of the accused. On occasion these unfortunates, pounced on by military police, were carried off into Russia in the middle of their nominal trial. Strong protests were repeatedly made by the British and American governments, in some of these cases, to the Russian Military Head of the Control Commission. But they were only made to be rejected. M. Nagy, who, as Premier of Hungary in the earlier part of last year, must be credited with some knowledge of the situation, has thrown useful light upon many aspects of this grim drama. And, in a recent appearance (in February 1948) before the American Senate, he explained, with special emphasis, both the development of the omnipotent Secret Police and the manner in which the ordinary Magyar citizen has been attacked in his elementary rights. As he tells us, he did his best to work with the Communists. But, as he was not, and was never likely to be, a tool—as he represented the freest and most honourable Magyar spirit—accusations, threats, and vital dangers were not long in touching even him. In May and early June 1947, while on holiday in Switzerland, his position became so imperilled that he wisely abstained from a return to Budapest, and to resigned and saved life and liberty by exile.

From afar he now watched the Russian penetration unfold—as he had watched it from the headship of the Government in the country itself. Now he fully realised that the Communist colleagues, with whom he had fancied he could cooperate, were not 'partners' at all. They were playing, not for but against the life and liberty of Hungary—the tremendous stakes of this terrible game. When the hapless patriot-premier would fain have broken off with them, he saw the doors were guarded by armed bullies—the Russian troops—who grasped their fire-arms menacingly enough. So, while in office, Nagy could but

continue this perilous cooperation and hope for the Dawn. And Dawn, he trusted, might come with the ratification of the Peace Treaty, and the evacuation of the Soviet troops. But, with his own exile, he saw his country fully brought within the Russian-Communist grip. Her plight, as he says, was now that of most of East Europe. Her problem had become part of 'that which weighs upon all the world to-day.'

Since M. Nagy's departure, first to the Helvetic and then to the great North American Republic (refuge, just now, of so many heroic spirits from Europe), things Hungarian have moved steadily in the same fatal direction. The Dance of Death has gone on. Despite the ratification of the Peace Treaty, even by Russia, at the end of August 1947; despite the departure of the Allied Central Commission, with its Russian chief, at the end of September; and despite the evacuation of at least the bulk of the Soviet troops before the end of last year—the Communist regime continues, develops, and dominates. The 'liquidation' of Opposition parties steadily proceeds. The secret political police is steadily built up, and its powers, already great, are being extended to enormity. The whole is somewhat reminiscent of the Inquisition in Spain. For this police—cry typical extremist champions of the Left, such as M. Rakosi and M. Szakasits—'must be in merciless hands.' Army and people must be purged. No strength must be left to the enemies of Democracy, whose infiltration must be stopped. These foes (it was said towards the end of last year) were getting bolder. They felt the favouring winds of Reaction blowing into their sails. They wormed their way into factories and mines and spread anti-Democratic views. It was high time to change all this.

A curious feature in the post-war situation in Hungary has been the antagonism that has developed between the two so-called 'Workers' Parties'—Communists and Social Democrats. Hence one cause of the Extreme Left outcry about 'Reaction,' 'Imperialism,' 'Fascism,' 'anti-Democratic activities,' and so forth. The incessant Communist efforts to absorb the rival body not unnaturally produced indignant reactions in the latter. Thus, at the end of last September, in one of the chief industrial centres of Hungary, the competing groups demonstrated violently

against one another. 'Down with the Communists,' 'To hell with *Workers' Unity*' were among the improper and unorthodox sentiments now heard from the Social Democratic crowd. While at the very same time the Government, now completely under Communist control, was issuing its new Programme—with 'No mercy towards reaction,' 'Everything to insure the purity of Democracy,' 'Investigation of the Wealth of Public Men' (and possible confiscation of such). And the Press of the Extreme Left was thundering against any franchise whatever being left to 'Enemies of Democracy,' 'sinister political forces,' or 'Fifth Column' people, 'linked with the New Imperialism.' Yet, despite all this, the Social Democrats were still maintaining a vigorous independence at the end of October 1947. Their general Conference showed no readiness to merge itself in Communism. New and important posts were created for one of the most aggressive leaders of the anti-Communist wing. And he had a seemingly respectful reception of his appeal for the 'removal' of the pro-Communist section of the Party, and for a ban on its 'base and stupid statements.'

This courageous attitude provoked fresh outbursts from the Communist ranks—under pressure from which the Trades Union Council of Hungary had just welcomed the Cominform of Warsaw (Oct. 16, 1947). The attainder (as we may call it) of some of the chief Opposition leaders was prepared. A spy organisation, of anti-Russian and anti-Communist character, was professedly discovered (November 3). A little later the police announced the unearthing of a regular Gunpowder Plot. Government 'by Decree' was authorised by Parliament (November 11). And the flight of prominent 'Right-Wing' politicians began again.

As I write (in March 1948) the liquidation of these Right-Wing elements in the Social Democratic Party of Hungary seems at last to be nearing completion. A few days ago most of the leading members of this section resigned—and it is common knowledge that at the March Congress' of the Party 'its pro-Communist leaders will agree to the formation of a "United" (otherwise Communist-ridden) Workers' Organisation.' So testifies one of our best expert witnesses.

Even the Church was drawn into the conflict. Early

in October there had been a meeting of Hungarian Bishops—at Vac (on October 8), and about a fortnight later their leader, Cardinal Mindszenty, the chief prelate of the national Church, in a letter to Premier Dinnyes, the pro-Communist successor of Nagy, summarised the results of this episcopal conference. (Yet, though sent on October 24, this letter was not published until November 9.) Our people, protested the Bishops, 'are being forced into the Communist Party,' though utterly opposed to Communism. Employment is now practically in Communist hands almost everywhere in Hungary. Moreover, the political police have organised a regular spy system.

To these protests the Cardinal added an appeal for all Hungarians—that they might enjoy peace, without fear and without molestation. (It may sound extravagant, and even Utopian, but his Eminence did actually petition for this !) The probable success of such protests and appeals might be gauged from the punishment quickly meted out to the only newspaper which dared to publish the same. This, the sole Roman Catholic journal in the country, was suspended for twenty-eight days. Can we wonder ? To demand peace, without fear and molestation—what arrogance !

Yet in mid-November there were fresh disturbances, fresh demonstrations against the Workers' Tribunals, and against 'brutal Communist pressure'—among the workers themselves. Fresh plots were professedly and incessantly discovered, and incessantly Opposition leaders and parties were declared to be implicated. Ever more and more 'purges of reactionary elements' were demanded and performed. The police-power must be in merciless hands, it was insisted. And merciless must be the executions.

Meantime, from Belgrade, as a centre, and with Marshal Tito, as leader and travelling-agent, the policy of Pan-Slav and Pan-Communist alliances was being vigorously pursued. All these 'liberated' states of East Central Europe, comprising the whole of Western Slavdom, together with Hungary and Rumania, throughout 1947 and the early months of the next year, were being diligently bound to one another, and to Russia, in the bonds of a uniting, militant, Communism. In these pacts a special purpose—of fighting German 'Imperialism'—was constantly proclaimed. Some kind of such Fascism might

be revived in the fairly near future—the Hungarian Foreign Minister warns his brother Communists a month before the Christmas of 1947. And every element of reaction in these liberated (that is, freshly-enslaved) lands is supposedly ready to further such a Teutonic resurrection. But what must—seriously, without irony—strike any calm observer is the terrific danger now developing to all Free Europe from that pure and perfect Democracy of Bolshevism, and the ever more crushing weight of tyranny pressing to death the hapless populations of Poland and Hungary, of Rumania and Bulgaria, of Slovakia and Croatia, and even of the Czech-Land. How can men recollect, now, the fate of the little Baltic peoples, and Baltic states—Esthonia, Latvia, Lithuania—who after some twenty years of emancipation are again swallowed up in slavery? That is a story of

‘the cruel, crawling foam,  
the cruel, hungry foam,’

of time past, a decade ago, and, I suppose, well-nigh forgotten. But perhaps the fresh threat to Finland may remind even the most obtuse of all this.

It goes without saying that the Communism or Bolshevism of Hungary, like that of other Russian-controlled states and peoples, is constantly giving aid to the Greek rebels. As a Communist deputy declared in Parliament at Budapest on January 13 of this year, ‘For the British this Government [in Greece] is legal. For us it is not.’ Yugoslavia and Bulgaria have been denounced as sources of supply to the Hellenic insurgents. But Communist Hungary, not so often thus noticed is not to be forgotten.

In mid-January of this year a patriotic Hungarian gentleman, an acute observer of the situation in its chief aspects, returned to his country after two months’ absence. The change in things he found simply ‘terrifying.’ Even he, who had lived through all the recent upheavals in his home-land, found it difficult once more to get his bearings. Hungary, he writes, has now become entirely dependent on Soviet Russia, and has been, moreover, transformed into a perfect pattern of a police state. Without external help it is now impossible to realise the will of the mass of the people, even if, and when, all Russian troops had permanently left the country.

The Communists, he found, had now really established themselves as the 'single ruling Party,' against whose wishes no measure could be carried through Parliament. Yet, even in the heavily 'manipulated' August elections of last year, Communism only secured 22 per cent. of the votes. 'In a free election' it would not have received ten.

So 'our present Parliament will pass into law any legal absurdity.' And the interference of the dominant party with the most ordinary principles of justice becomes increasingly arrogant and grotesque. Thus the Worker's Tribunals, having shown at first a disconcerting moderation, are now coached. Prospective members of such bodies have to pass a course of instruction. And the sentences of the Tribunals have become faultless in their severity. Seven years' penal servitude, for instance, were inflicted on a baker who made cakes from 'white' flour. Again, the National Council of People's Tribunals has been suspended because of 'Fascist activities'—'its legally trained members,' M. Leves explains, having reduced certain extravagant sentences. Five of its six departments are to have new chairmen. Still better is the example of the Communist Press comment on the new law (in preparation) for abolishing the immovability of judges. 'Those who . . . will not pass *democratic* verdicts [and sentences] cannot remain.' At the least they must be transferred to spheres 'where their inner convictions will have limited scope.' What candour!

For the more perfect completion of the Russo-Communist schemes, and the more perfect realisation of the police state, in Hungary, it was, of course, useful to let down the iron curtain as rigidly as possible. And this, already effected to a great degree (and, *inter alia*, by measures already noticed here), was still further accomplished by the heavy tax imposed on all persons crossing the frontier—by the confiscation of the property of those travellers who did not return—and by the police permits now required for any foreign journey, and only granted, of course, in cases of 'political reliability.'

Yet it surely remains true that Magyar Communism is repellent to the people. (And, within limits, may not this be said of Russia itself?) Only by foreign arms, and by devices resting upon those arms, has Bolshevism deceptively mastered Hungary.

RAYMOND BEAZLEY.



## Art. 10.—U.S.A. PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION.

THE approach of another Presidential election in the United States finds the traditional exuberance of the spirit of its citizens in times of prosperity tempered by a sense of frustrated bewilderment. An addition of a million workers to payrolls over the peak figure of sixty millions recorded in March 1947 testifies to the highest scale of economic activity in the Republic's history, and the aggregate income of the nation has mounted far above the most optimistic forecasts made at the close of the late war. Never have the profits of industrial, commercial, financial, and other corporations been so large; for example, the net earnings of 960 leading manufacturing corporations in 1947 after the payment of taxes were placed at roughly 3.2 billion dollars, which represented an increase of nearly 50 per cent. over the comparable figure for 1946 and the returns upon their capital averaged 17.1 per cent. as compared with 12 per cent. But a very large share of these huge earnings enured to the benefit of a limited number of people and no country has ever contained so many immensely rich people as the United States does to-day. There has been a progressive concentration of wealth and economic power in a few favoured hands and not long ago a writer in the 'New Republic' asserted that 31 per cent. of the productive economic machine of the United States was now controlled by five powerful groups, centring round the J. P. Morgan firm, the Rockefeller, Mellon, and Dupont families, and a lesser clique of families in Cleveland, Ohio. But, while this consolidation of financial and economic power has been proceeding, millions of workers and of the white-collared middle-class have been facing a continual strain through the high cost of living, which has climbed to a record level as the result of the inflationary processes set in motion by the war, and the glaringly inequitable distribution of the present national prosperity is the fly in the American ointment and furnishes abundant ammunition for critics of the existing order.

To-day millions of Americans are bitterly aggrieved about high prices and rents which force lowered standards of living and are disposed to blame for their troubles 'big business' and its political henchmen. They are also

appalled at the prospect of immersion in another war and, although most of them are much better informed about international affairs than they were thirty years ago, the average American remains in a state of mental confusion about foreign policy except on one point. Apart from the followers of Henry Wallace, they are deeply exasperated with Russia, whom they regard as the destroyer of their hopes of settled peace, and so they have given steady approval to the bi-partisan foreign policy, which has been evolved at Washington and endorsed by Congress for the purpose of checking the aggressive designs of Russia and halting the spread of Communism. They hope that their free-handed generosity to the democratic countries of Europe and China will bear the fruits desired, and they derive some comfort from the possession of the secret of the atomic bomb, but they have grave forebodings, increased by recent pessimistic pronouncements from Washington, that another grim ordeal awaits them. So it is in a mood of anxiety and frustration that the mass of the American people have begun the prolonged political battle which is always necessary to determine the character of their government for the next four years.

The American voters have for nearly a century shown remarkable fidelity to their two historic parties, the Democrats and the Republicans, and have only on rare occasions given serious support to new parties of protest, and there seems no prospect that the latest competitor of this type, the Progressive party founded by Mr Henry Wallace, can this year offer any serious challenge to their ascendancy. Each of these senior parties represents a cross section of the American people and draws its support from a variety of economic, social, sectional, and racial groups of which all the members are not in unison about every current issue or about the methods of executing policies. Each party is therefore afflicted by a certain unwieldiness and the enforcement of discipline within their ranks is often difficult. Inside each there is a perennial struggle between the conservative and liberal wings for supremacy and even radicals of advanced views, who are not socialists, have found harbourage in them. In the eighty-three years elapsed since the close of the Civil War the Republicans have been the stronger party, winning twelve out of the twenty presidential elections fought

during that period and, although at the time of the foundation of their party its programme was reckoned radical, it is now counted the conservative party of the United States.

The Democratic party, which was founded by Thomas Jefferson in 1792, has a longer record of continuity as a party, and through its overwhelming predominance in the states of the 'Solid South,' in which the Republicans are a feeble minority, it can claim with some justice that it is the only nation-wide party; it is also the party mainly favoured by the largest religious minority, the Roman Catholics. It has as the champion of sectional grievances always attracted considerable support in the West, and it has had a strong following among the working-classes in the northern cities. But its pretensions to be the only effective instrument of political and economic liberalism have not secured general acceptance, because the ingrained conservatism of its supporters among the upper classes in the southern states has always operated as a brake upon its progressive tendencies and its influence has kept many liberals in the Republican fold. Indeed since the civil war it has only been able to attain office when its liberal elements, under the leadership of men of uncommon quality like Grover Cleveland, Woodrow Wilson, and Franklin Roosevelt, having achieved control of its policies and machine, were able to make it a vigorous agency for progressive reforms.

The longest spell of power in this century came under Franklin Roosevelt, a liberal aristocrat, who combined a singularly attractive personality with superlative skill as a politician and was a virtuoso as an electioneering artist and broadcaster. But the assiduous application of all Roosevelt's varied talents was required to keep in the line the heterogeneous forces comprising the Democratic party, and in his later years of office he was continually at loggerheads with the Rightist Democrats from the South, who often helped the Republicans to defeat or mutilate his legislation. In the elections of 1932 and 1936 Roosevelt secured record majorities, but under normal circumstances he would not have ventured to defy the long-established tradition against a third term for any President, and his successor would almost certainly have been defeated by the late Wendell Willkie in 1940. However, after the

Second World War began in Europe, the stock of confidence and affection which Roosevelt had built up for himself created such a widespread popular desire for the retention of his tested leadership in troublous times that he was renominated by his party and given a third mandate. And, after he led his country into the war, his partnership with Winston Churchill proved so harmonious and successful that its termination before victory was achieved became almost unthinkable and he was re-elected in 1944, but with a reduced majority. The exceptional circumstances of the elections of 1940 and 1944 therefore interfered with the normal swing of the political pendulum, and after sixteen years of office the Democratic party under any leadership would be due for defeat this year.

The death of Roosevelt left an enormous vacuum in American public life and a waning political estate to his successor, Mr Truman. A man of his background, training, and limitations inevitably presented a dull contrast to the glamorous personality of Roosevelt, but he was respected as an honest and adroit politician and he was credited with a sincere desire to continue the policies of his great predecessor and to keep the Democratic party on liberal paths, while his modesty and simple ways of life were liked by the country. As in his first two years of office he struggled manfully with a welter of baffling problems, his stock of popularity rose and fell and it reached its peak a year ago when the evidence of Gallup polls and other tests was showing that it was substantially higher than that of any Republican leader. But since 1948 began, the outstanding development in the American political scene has been the steady deterioration of Mr Truman in popular favour and the growing revolt in his own party against his renomination for the Presidency.

It is all to his credit that he sponsored a liberal programme of civil rights, which proposed a Federal anti-lynching law, the abolition of racial segregation in interstate commerce, and the elimination of the indefensible poll-tax, which keeps the great majority of negroes in the southern states from voting. These measures, however, and particularly the move against the poll-tax, aroused great indignation in the South, where they are regarded as menacing the preservation of white supremacy, and even liberals like Mr Hill and Mr Sparkman, the two

Senators from Alabama, joined with hardened reactionaries in denouncing the programme and threatening to secede from the Democratic party unless it was abandoned. Such a revolt in the South, the traditional stronghold of Democracy, posed a very awkward problem for Mr Truman, but he might have surmounted it if he had retained his popularity in other sections of the country. The Southern Democrats had swallowed almost as severe doses of unpalatable legislation from Roosevelt and, since they could not easily make an alliance with the Republicans or with the party of Mr Wallace, who both favoured the civil rights' programme, they would probably have fallen into line when election day came round if they thought that Mr Truman had any chance of winning. But what is a much more serious matter for Mr Truman is the mounting revolt against his leadership in the northern and central states. The Democratic 'bosses' in the cities of those regions know that he has alienated the Jewish vote, which is an important factor in many of them, by his reversal of his original endorsement of partition for Palestine, and that he has antagonised many trades unionists by his comparatively feeble resistance to anti-labour legislation passed by the Republican majority in Congress. So these 'bosses' see no hope of electing their local candidates under the leadership of Truman, and one of the most influential of them, Colonel Arvey of Chicago, has pronounced firmly against his renomination.

The fundamental cause of Mr Truman's troubles is that he chose to discard as advisers most of the Rooseveltian liberals and select as his Cabinet colleagues and private counsellors men who, with the notable exception of General Marshall, the Secretary of State, were of second-rate mental calibre and conservative outlook. The result has been a general loss of confidence in the capacity of Mr Truman and his entourage to cope effectively with the paramount problems of the day, the issues of peace and war involved in the division of the world into two hostile camps, the Palestinian problem, the racial clash in the South, the high cost of living, and industrial relations. So marked has been the ineptitude of some of Mr Truman's recent actions and policies that papers like the two weekly organs of the intellectual liberals, the 'New Republic' and the 'Nation,' have both urged Mr Truman to recognise

that he is simply not equipped for the tremendous responsibilities of his office and renounce all ambitions for a second term.

However, the President's control of the party machine, although seriously weakened, and of patronage might muster sufficient votes at the convention to secure his renomination, and the Democrats who remain loyal to him argue that no party which discarded an occupant of the White House could hope to win and that any other candidate who might be chosen would have to run on Mr Truman's record. But the answer given to the first argument is that four out of six Presidents who took office through the death of their predecessors were denied renomination by their parties and that any presentable Democratic leader would have a better chance of victory than Mr Truman. The contention against the second argument is that the injection of a new personality, who had a clean slate and enjoyed the respect of the voters, into the contest would raise fresh issues and eliminate the need for apologies about the record of the Truman administration.

But the canvass of the merits of possible substitutes for Mr Truman reveals no wide range of choice. Mr Ellis Arnall of Georgia, who had an excellent record as a reforming governor of his state and who has outlined a liberal programme for the Democratic party in an interesting book 'The Horizon dimly seen,' is the most attractive of the party's younger politicians, but his prestige is local rather than national. So consideration is being given to the claims of two judges of the Supreme Court, Chief-Justice Vinson and Mr Justice W. O. Douglas, who were both trusted lieutenants of Roosevelt before their elevation to the judiciary, but it is highly doubtful if either of them would give up the security of their present positions to risk the vicissitudes of a political career when the odds are so strongly against a Democratic victory. Accordingly the minds of a number of influential Democrats are now turning to the possibility of enlisting General Eisenhower, now a civilian and President of Columbia University, as their party's candidate for the Presidency.

Taken at its face value, the disclaimer of all political ambitions made by General Eisenhower to a newspaper publisher, who wanted to support him for the Republican

nomination, seemed very explicit. Arguing that the wise and necessary subordination of military to civilian power was best achieved when life-long professional soldiers abstained from seeking high political office and that there was a wide choice of civilian leaders, he declared that he was 'not available' and that his decision to remove himself completely from the political scene was definite and final. But the theory is held that General Eisenhower cannot accommodate his own liberal views to the conservatism of the Republican party and that, if the Democrats adopted a genuinely liberal programme, a more or less unanimous offer of their nomination might find him responsive. At any rate it was noted that, when an effort was made to discover his attitude towards such an offer, he did not repeat his earlier statement but entrusted the task of making a milder disavowal of political aspirations to a friend.

But the Democratic leaders, who see in Eisenhower their only hope of victory, realise that a mere call of politicians from the Democratic convention to rescue their party from impending defeat would have no appeal to him. So their strategy is to encourage and stimulate the widest possible popular demand for his nomination. They think that if the clouds on the international horizon darken during the summer there may well be a nation-wide clamour, surging up far outside the orbit of the Democratic party, for Eisenhower to be given the helm of state and that, if the Democratic convention made itself the instrument for transmitting this demand to him, he might accede to it.

Mr Walter Lippmann, the well-known American publicist, holds that the persistence of the boom for Eisenhower in face of his efforts to check it reveals the dominant political mood of the American people, a desire to get rid of the discredited Truman administration, tempered by fears that the alternative might be worse. In Mr Lippmann's view, Eisenhower towers high above all the present political leaders in their minds and he thus described their visualisation of him as the ideal President.

'It is the portrait of a man who has been outside the divisions and dissensions of party, section, class, and creed and would remain above them: able therefore to strike the chords of unity; an exponent not only of liberty but of fraternity; a conqueror without rancour or vainglory; a



strong man and therefore unfrightened ; a brave man and therefore magnanimous and around whom they could rally with confidence and serenity.'

This portrait of Eisenhower is not unduly flattering and the tests of the Gallup polls indicate that millions of Americans feel that he is the only man who could adequately fill the shoes of Roosevelt, and that he has the confidence of the workers who are now well organised in their unions for political action.

But any inclination that General Eisenhower might have to consider the Democratic nomination has possibly been weakened by the results of the primary elections which have been held up to date. At these elections, which are an integral part of the political machinery of the United States, the registered voters of each party elect their delegates for their national conventions and they usually provide a reliable index of public sentiment about the rival candidates and their policies. The Democratic primaries have attracted little interest, because the discontent with President Truman has not been mobilised in favour of any rival candidate, but many delegates, elected as Trumanites, do not regard their pledges of support as binding beyond the first ballot and the attitude of the Southern Democrats has still to be determined. So public attention has naturally been centred upon the keen contest for the Republican nomination which has been proceeding in the primaries of that party and their results have been very illuminating. General MacArthur, Governor Warren of California, and Mr Martin, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, have received such trivial support in the primaries which they entered that the issue at the convention will lie between four candidates, Governor Dewey of New York, Senator Taft of Ohio, Mr Stassen of Minnesota, and Senator Vandenberg of Michigan.

Governor Dewey began his climb to fame when in the role of city attorney his legal skill and courage freed New York from the criminal activities of bands of gangsters, and the prestige thus gained resulted in his election as Governor of the state of New York in 1942. Two years later the Republicans chose him as their Presidential candidate and he gave Roosevelt a closer run than any of

his three other opponents. He has given his state honest and efficient administration and his views on many issues are distinctly liberal, but his critics assert that he is nothing more than a clever politician who is ready to trim his sails to any wind that blows, and it is a black mark against him that although he was obviously a candidate for renomination, he declined resolutely until a few months ago to make any definite pronouncement upon a single important issue of national politics for the country's guidance. Personal popularity has eluded him through a certain arrogance of temper and the 'New Yorker' magazine once spiced a biographical sketch of Mr Dewey with the deadly thrust that only those who knew him well disliked him.

Senator Taft as the son of a former President, W. H. Taft, starts with the advantage of an honoured name, and since 1939 he has been a prominent and very valuable member of the Senate in which he leads the Republicans. He has earned the respect of his opponents by his political abilities and his intellectual honesty, and his enormous industry has given him a greater knowledge of the processes of government in the United States than any contemporary politician possesses. His fundamental conservatism of outlook has always been modified by streaks of liberalism and, although he has been a severe critic of the bi-partisan foreign policy, he has shed completely his earlier isolationism. He has never been afraid to admit errors of judgment or face unpopularity for his beliefs, and his aversion to demagoguery has always made him reluctant to make empty promises; in the primary contest in Nebraska—a farming state—for instance, he lost votes by refusing to pledge himself to establish a 'floor' for the prices of farm products on the ground that it would involve rigid economic controls. Unfortunately too his virtues are offset by a curious parochialism on certain questions and a deplorable absence of the gifts which make for personal popularity. So it is a tragedy for the Republicans that their only leader whose character, intellect, and experience give him real qualifications for the Presidency should be counted such a poor vote-getter, that a lesser man who has the arts of electioneering at his command may be preferred to him.

The youngest of the Republican aspirants is Mr Harold Stassen of Minnesota who, when at the youthful age of

thirty-one he organised in 1938 a revolt against the 'Old Guard' of the Republican party in his own state and contrived his own election as its governor, was regarded as a political prodigy. Re-elected in 1940, he interrupted his political career to serve as flag secretary to Admiral Halsey, the commander of the American fleet in the Pacific. After the death of Wendell Willkie, whose candidacy he promoted in 1944, he took his place as the chief spokesman of the progressive wing of the Republican party; as one of the delegates of the United States he helped to draft the charter of the United Nations at San Francisco; he has consistently opposed both isolationism and a high tariff policy and he was the first prominent Republican to advocate aid for Europe on a generous scale but with the reservation that its beneficiaries should agree to abandon all adventures in Socialism, between which and Communism he makes no distinction. On domestic issues his views are a strange medley of conservatism and liberalism. He advocates various useful reforms, but his attitude to labour problems has antagonised many workers and his violent hostility to Russia, his opposition to price control, and his pronouncement that no taxpayer should be asked to hand over more than half of his income to the state has made him suspect by many of the liberals for whose vote he is bidding. Styled 'the man moose from Minnesota' on account of his gigantic physique, he has for two years been conducting a dramatic and ubiquitous campaign, ranging over the country in a plane, and it is to his credit that he has taken the issues to the voters in a multitude of public meetings and spoken with astonishing frankness on every conceivable question from Palestine to margarine.

Senator Vandenberg of Michigan is a newspaper editor who has been a member of the Senate since 1928. In his earlier days at Washington he took a rightist line on domestic problems and was a firm isolationist, but about 1945 he was suddenly transformed into a liberal and ardent internationalist. As Chairman of the Foreign Affairs' Committee of the Senate he deserves great credit for keeping the foreign policy of the United States on a non-partisan basis and for persuading the great majority of the Republican politicians to endorse the Marshall plan, and no Republican leader has gained so much in political stature and popular esteem in the last three years. His

age of sixty-four is counted a disability for the Presidency, but he is only seven months older than Mr Truman.

The prospects of these four candidates can now be appraised in the light of the results of Republican primaries, in which about 300 out of the total number of 1094 delegates present at the convention have been elected. On May 1 Governor Dewey had a nominal lead with 124 delegates pledged to him. It was inevitable that he would get the solid support of the ninety delegates from his own state of New York, but his failure to prevent Stassen from getting two delegates out of nine in the adjacent state of New Hampshire and his inability to win a single delegate in Wisconsin or more than one out of eighteen in Nebraska, two states which gave him solid backing in 1944, argued that the traditional prejudice of the Republicans against renominating a defeated Presidential candidate is operating against him. He managed to secure all the delegates from the western state of Oklahoma, but it was a bad omen that he ran behind Stassen in the primaries in the great eastern state of Pennsylvania, although its delegates were left unpledged, except for a complimentary vote to their local leader Senator Martin.

Mr Stassen, as the favourite son of Minnesota, naturally secured a solid delegation from his own state, but what has advanced his stock was his sweeping victory in the adjacent state of Wisconsin, where he has nineteen out of its twenty-seven delegates, and his later success in Nebraska, where he took eleven out of its eighteen delegates and ran well ahead of both Dewey and Taft. He can now count upon the reinforcement of the fifty-nine delegates definitely pledged to him by the majority of the seventy-three delegates from Pennsylvania, which will bring him close to Dewey's total, and although he is still a long way from the nomination he has now emerged as a very formidable competitor.

Senator Taft encountered a serious setback in the only primary, that of Nebraska, for which his name was entered so far, as in spite of the backing of the local Republican machine he polled a poor vote and only elected a single delegate. However, the managers of his campaign claim that practically all the Republican delegates from the southern states will support him and that he will have good backing from the northern-central states. He faces a crucial test in the primary in his own state of Ohio and if

Stassen, who has invaded it and is attacking him vigorously as a conservative 'diehard,' can elect even one-fourth of Ohio's sixty-three delegates, the blow to Taft's prospects will be very serious. Senator Vandenberg has refused to announce that he is a candidate, but he has at his disposal the forty-one delegates from Michigan, and in the primary in Nebraska for which his name was entered without his consent he showed some strength.

But the encouraging feature of the Republicans' primaries so far held is the revelation that the great majority of this party now favour the views and policies of Stassen, Dewey, and Vandenberg and have lost patience with the reactionary obscurantism of the 'Old Guard.' The dividing line between Stassen and Dewey is personal rivalry rather than any fundamental divergence of outlook and Vandenberg is in reasonable conformity with both, being unacceptable only to the extreme right wing. But, since the latter is no longer in a position to defy the will of the party, conditions have become propitious for the progressive elements in it to take charge of its fortunes and achieve for it either before or at its convention an effective unity for the coming election.

It may well happen that the personal rivalry of Dewey and Stassen and the opposition of Taft and his friends to the selection of either will produce a temporary deadlock in the convention, and in that event the 'bosses' of the party's machine, who have all too often conspired to give the nomination to some second-rate politician like Harding, will take charge of the situation. If they conformed to the wishes of the financial and business magnates, who will supply the campaign funds, they would range themselves behind the conservative Taft, but the difficulty of electing him if the progressive elements of the party were lukewarm might induce them to favour Vandenberg as the most acceptable candidate to all the factions. The objection to his age could be removed if he undertook not to seek a second term of office and if Stassen through his nomination for the Vice-Presidency was acknowledged as his political heir-apparent. As the authors of the Taft-Hartley labour code, which is very obnoxious to labour, the Republicans will have to reckon with the hostility of both wings of the labour movement—the American Federation of Labour and the C.I.O.—but they will count upon the labour vote

being split between the Democrats and the Progressives. At any rate a Vandenberg-Stassen team would be the most formidable ticket that the Republicans could present to the voters and only the intervention of Eisenhower on the Democratic side could prevent it from making the result of the election a foregone conclusion. It would be a great gain for the whole world if there was soon available a reasonably definite assurance that the policies of the United States for the next four years would be under the direction of leaders who had rejected for ever isolation and aspired to make their country give the fullest possible contribution to the peace and prosperity of the world.

Faced with the certainty of defeat by a Vandenberg-Stassen combination the Democrats would be divided in their counsels. One faction would argue that Mr Truman might as well go down to defeat as any other candidate, but others will contend that his retention as leader would result in a wholesale defection of labourite and other voters to the Progressive party and might reduce the Democratic party to the same state of feebleness as prevented the Republican party from functioning as an effective opposition during the first two administrations of Roosevelt. So, with the fate of the British Liberal party before their eyes, they will demand the replacement of Mr Truman by somebody whose leadership will give the Democrats a chance of electing their candidates for the two Houses of Congress and for governorships. But only the voluntary withdrawal of Mr Truman will produce a satisfactory solution of their problem for the Democrats.

It remains to consider the prospects of the new Progressive party founded by Mr Wallace, a former Vice-President and member of three of Roosevelt's Cabinets. This politician is derided in many quarters as a 'crackpot' and 'woolly-minded idealist' and his political record shows some strange aberrations. But an expert agriculturist, who by inventing hybrid maize made money for himself and increased materially the grain production of North America, cannot be dismissed as an unpractical dreamer, and Mr Wallace is now applying his long experience and skill as a campaigner with assiduous energy to the collection of votes. He has always had a considerable personal following of radicals and, while his party will be the natural refuge of the disgruntled Democrats, it will

also attract the leftist elements in the trade unions and numerous farmers. So, while it is true that its candidate's recent capture of what was rated a Democratic stronghold in New York was largely due to the desire of its numerous Jewish voters to punish Mr Truman's volte face on the Palestinian problem, the Gallup and other test polls suggest that the Progressive party will poll a vote of between five and ten millions, which would be a very encouraging start for a new party. Its intervention will be more damaging to the Democrats than to their rivals, but it will attract the votes of a certain number of Republican isolationists, who will accept Mr Wallace's thesis that the Marshall plan and the proposal for universal military training are part of a sinister design to force the issue with Russia to the arbitrament of war. The charge that Wallace is backed by the Communists will tell against him and his rejection of Socialism has impelled its American devotees to renominate their perennial candidate, Mr Norman Thomas. Mr Wallace can have no hope of giving either of the older parties a close race and obviously his main objective is to promote disintegration of the Democratic party by a calamitous defeat and pave the way for the installation of his own party as the recognised instrument of leftist sentiment in the United States.

JOHN A. STEVENSON.



## SOME RECENT BOOKS.

- Stuart and Georgian Churches Outside London, 1603-1837.** Marcus Whiffen.
- The Age of Adam.** James Lees-Milne.
- The Regency Style.** Donald Pilcher.
- Local Style in English Architecture.** Thomas Dinham Atkinson.
- India Called Them.** Lord Beveridge.
- The Sentence of the Court.** Leo Page.
- The Growth of Twelve Masterpieces.** Charles Johnson.
- Devil's Decade.** Collin Brooks.
- Forced Labour in Soviet Russia.** David J. Dallin and Boris I. Nicolaevsky.
- Fashionable Brighton, 1820-1860.** Anthony Dale.
- The Classical Background of English Literature.** J. A. K. Thomson.
- Harrow School, Yesterday and To-day.** Dr E. D. Laborde.
- In the Golden Days.** Francis W. Hirst.
- What Life has Taught Me.** Edited by Sir James Marchant.
- The International Who's Who.**
- The Public Schools Question.** Canon Spencer Leeson.
- Georgian Edinburgh.** Ian G. Lindsay.

MR MARCUS WHIFFEN in his 'Stuart and Georgian Churches Outside London, 1603 to 1837' (Batsford) ably fills in what is really a marked gap in architectural literature. The metropolitan bias of historians, we are told, has been among the contributory factors obscuring the wealth of Stuart and Georgian architecture outside London. We nowadays admire almost anything that by stretching the word to breaking point can be called Georgian, yet somehow the churches are left out of the picture. We can see an English country house of the classical period as the setting of a certain kind of life, and a kind which, across the years from a harsh present, may appear almost paradisaical. But the English church of the same period conjures up no such agreeable picture. And yet there is much that is wonderfully attractive in the subject which, beginning with the latest phases of medieval Gothic, passes on to the splendours of Wren baroque classic and to the full classic of the mid-eighteenth century, changing again later to the Gothic revival of, say, Barry and Pugin. One of the outstanding achievements of English church architecture has been the marriage of steeples and spires of obvious Gothic ancestry with buildings drawing their descent from Roman or Greek temples, or indeed claiming to be nothing more than rectangular preaching houses with some classic features, but entirely lacking the somewhat mystical inspiration of the great Gothic fanes.

From the fantastic rococo Gothic of Shobdon to the austerity of, say, Chiselhampton is a long journey, but it shows the amazing variety of our churches and with Mr Whiffen's text as guide and over 150 quite excellent photographs in the best Batsford style we can survey and enjoy the work of Wren, Gibbs, Hawksmoor, Hiorns, Rickman, Goodwin, Revett, Bastard, Burton, Hardwick and many others, now largely forgotten but worthy of remembrance for their achievements.

Another attractive book from Messrs Batsford's is 'The Age of Adam,' by James Lees-Milne, whose aim it is to show of what the work of Robert Adam and his brothers really consisted, from what sources it was derived, what contemporary architects were affected by it, and what its influence was overseas. It is Robert Adam, perhaps not unnaturally, who dominates the scene; his brothers are in the background. There are three marked periods, the first from 1758 to 1770, the beginning of the Adelphi setback. This was the period of advancing successes, exemplified by strenuous country-house building and showing Robert's more robust architectural style. Then comes the middle period of rivalry and a directive towards town-house building and coinciding with his decorative and too often fussy style. Thirdly, from 1780 till Robert's death in 1792, comes the period of unfulfilment when he reverted to his monumental ambitions, concentrating again on exterior effects. The different periods are explained by detailed studies of a large selection of Adam country and town houses and adorned by 200 or more illustrations artistically reproduced. Adam himself wrote 'Painting and sculpture depend more upon architecture than one would imagine. They are the necessary accompaniments of the great style of architecture; and a building that makes no provision for them and does not even demand them as necessary adjuncts, I would at once pronounce to be wretched.' That really is the key to the work of the Adam brothers and Mr Lees-Milne is to be congratulated on the successful and interesting way in which he develops the theme.

Two more attractive and useful books from Messrs Batsford call for attention, of which the first is 'The Regency Style' and the second 'Local Style in English Architecture.'

'**The Regency Style**,' is by Donald Pilcher. The title needs some modification because to get a comprehensive view of the subject a period longer than the actual ten years of the Regency is required, and therefore the book covers the years 1800 to 1830, and secondly because *Style* should certainly be in the plural. The then arbiters of taste wallowed in Gothic, Greek, Roman, Egyptian, Indian, Picturesque, Sublime, Rustic, and Urban creations, each with its own individual characteristics and yet all somehow fitting into the general Regency pattern. The Men of Taste took themselves seriously and 'when in conformity with Picturesque principles, houses went Greek or Gothic, so did the people who lived in them. Its devotee who built himself a Gothic tower adopted the monkish habit along with his architecture.' Moreover, the Regency was as much concerned with the surroundings of the house as with the house itself. 'They had started by carrying the house into the landscape. They finished by bringing the garden into the house.' Mr Pilcher gives us most interesting chapters on 'The Man of Taste,' 'The Landscape Garden and its Influence,' 'Taste and Technique,' 'Town and Countryside,' and 'Towards a Regency Style'—this last is skilfully worked out but we think that most readers will still feel that it should be in the plural. At any rate readers will get much instruction and enjoyment from the book.

The aim of '**Local Style in English Architecture**,' by Thomas Dinham Atkinson, F.R.I.B.A., is to consider and elucidate the regional styles of architecture which developed in various parts of the country. The splendid fifteenth-century towers of Somerset churches, the half-timber work of the Welsh borders, and the wonderful craftsmanship of the East Anglian church roofs are quoted as outstanding examples. What were the causes of these local variations? They may be summed up as 'the structure and formation of the land, the elements of which our race is built up, the requirements of religion, the introduction of foreign ideas, the accumulation of wealth, conditions affecting the transport of materials, and finally that elusive thing we call fashion'—and in this fashion is the deliberate copying of other buildings which have captured the fancy! In addition to dealing with this in the text Mr Atkinson gives a very interesting list of these copies in an appendix.

After dealing with the factors of local variation, and variations on particular features, the author in 30 pages gives a most instructive survey up and down the country showing how these variations actually worked out. There is a coloured frontispiece, over 120 excellent monochrome illustrations, and very useful maps showing the local distribution of special features—and the whole book is packed with useful information, carefully arranged.

Lord Beveridge in '**India Called Them**' (Allen and Unwin) writes the story of his parents' lives. After the complexities of the branches of the Beveridge family in and near Dunfermline through three generations (mercifully enlightened by an annotated genealogical table) and of his mother's family, the Akroyds in the Midlands, Lord Beveridge takes us to India with his father Henry, joining the I.C.S. in 1858. To India he gave 35 years of devoted service, largely as District and Sessions Judge, away from the big cities. He never reached the High Court judgeship for which he hoped, due largely perhaps to his independent spirit and outspoken views which did not always please Authority. Sorrow came early with the death of his beloved young wife and her baby after only two years of marriage. Then he met and married Annette Akroyd and began a wonderful partnership which lasted till death came to both in 1929, he then being 92 and she 87. The chronic trouble of Indian service afflicted them like others—fathers tied to work, children unable to live in India, and mothers torn between the two. But partings and absences are the opportunities of letter writers and Henry and Annette were correspondents on a vast and comprehensive scale on all matters on earth and elsewhere, past, present, and future. 'I think,' wrote Henry, 'that we are both rather too critical and too much inclined to take things *en sérieux*. It is right to be serious and to attach everything to fundamental principles, but this may sometimes induce mistakes by attaching too much importance to things.' That perhaps is the keynote of the book, which is a study of two strong, serious, but lovable characters, and also of life in an unusual setting. It is a lengthy work but, needless to say coming from so able an author, it is very well written and Henry and Annette are portrayed vividly in all their joys and sorrows, heart searchings, doubts, convictions, and views on life.

Mr Leo Page writes with great authority and wide experience in penology. His criticisms and suggestions should therefore command attention and respect, especially in the 'Quarterly' as much of the contents of his book '**The Sentence of the Court**' (Faber) was originally given in his articles in our pages. The text for the book might well be the saying of the late Mr Justice McCardie, 'Anybody can try a case. That is as easy as falling off a log. The difficulty comes in knowing what to with a man once he has been found guilty.' Mr Page's aim is to prove that no judge can find the wisest treatment of offenders unless he is possessed of certain specialised knowledge, but under our present system the preponderance of the judges of this country do not possess the skill and knowledge which they should have. The large majority of cases are tried in Petty Sessions, yet J.P.'s on appointment are not required to prove that they have any knowledge of the law which they are to administer or have ever even visited a prison. Mr Page gives case after case to prove that the repetition of short sentences is almost useless for any good purpose. 'The long sentence is an effective protection for the community. More important still, it alone provides any opportunity for reformatory treatment; either moral, industrial, or psychological. Humane remedial treatment will never be the cause of further offences.' Mr Page brings much convincing evidence to prove his argument and makes many practical and useful proposals for remedying the great defects which his evidence reveals. Undoubtedly this is a most interesting and really important book.

'**The Growth of Twelve Masterpieces**,' by Charles Johnson (Phoenix House), is, amongst much else, a brilliant example of the splendid manner in which our publishers have met, and largely overcome, unprecedented difficulties. Mr Johnson is an Official Lecturer at the National Gallery and as such, and as the author of two studies on English painting, can be relied upon to provide informed and persuasive commentary; but, in a book such as this, it is the illustrations that come first: if they are unsatisfactory the best text in the world must be ineffective. The six plates in colour are examples of works by Ugo da Siena, Antonello da Messina, El Greco, Nicolas Poussin, Constable, and Cézanne, and cover a period of some five

hundred years. The plates in monochrome, many of which are very lovely, number no less than sixty, and stretch from the twelfth century 'Mélisande Psalter' to a Cézanne study in the Courtauld Institute of Fine Art. Mr Johnson has had the happy idea of, where such exist, putting side by side the painter's two versions of the same subject; this, to the inexpert, is most helpful as very often the examples hang far apart. The volume, for instance, includes reproductions of three versions of El Greco's 'Purification of the Temple.' Both the Louvre and the National Gallery versions of Leonardo's 'Virgin of the Rocks' are given in full-page reproductions, amplified by five detailed studies, including the utterly lovely brush drawing in black and white on bluish paper of the Study of Drapery for the London picture which is at Windsor Castle. Mr Johnson draws attention to the interesting fact that in the figure of the Christ Child and elsewhere in the London picture marks of the painter's thumb are visible!

The publishers are justified in claiming that this is a new kind of book on Art inasmuch as it insists, and shows, that a masterpiece grows bit by bit in the artist's mind; the stages being inspiration, observation, experiment, achievement. Mr Johnson is well qualified by temperament, experience, and opportunity to provide us with what is in effect a biography of each of his skilfully chosen Twelve Masterpieces.

'Devil's Decade,' by Collin Brooks (Macdonald), is, we are told, a 'series of pen portraits—frank, incisive, and epigrammatic—of personalities of the years 1930 to 1939.' The portraits are certainly vivid and forceful, sometimes laudatory, often critical but always showing the author's views clearly and beyond doubt, as is only to be expected from the Editor of 'Truth.' It is perhaps somewhat inappropriate that in a book with such a title the first places should be given to King George V, King Edward VIII, and our present King! However, most of the company which enters the book with them shows that there can be no personal association with the rule of the Devil. We are shown, among others, Winston Churchill, Neville Chamberlain, Anthony Eden, Ramsay MacDonald, Lord Simon, Lord Beaverbrook, Noel Coward, John Gielgud, Montagu Norman, Bernard Shaw, Sybil Thorndike, and

Leslie Henson, as well as Ivar Kreuger and Dr Schacht. We may suitably quote a specimen passage: 'Upon no single pair of shoulders can the blame be laid that in 1940 England stood alone. The insensate folly of the Labour Party in not recognising that Britain must be armed if she were to deal with an ambitious and unscrupulous Germany, the shared folly of that Party, Mr. Baldwin and Mr Eden in continuing after the Manchurian incident to believe that the League of Nations was an effective instrument—these were major factors. But no historian can view with other than doubt, if not downright blame, a record at the Foreign Office which in ten years left Britain friendless after the wealth of friends and allies with whom she had finished the first German War.' But surely the Editor of 'Truth' should know that self-sufficiency is autarky and not autarchy!

From a political point of view there is less need now than six months ago of works revealing the truth about conditions in Russia. Recent events have moved with dizzy rapidity, and all save the irredeemably prejudiced must be convinced of the abominations wrought in that wretched country by the dictatorship of the Communist Party. In this task of enlightening public opinion in America and England Mr David J. Dallin, a Russian by nationality at birth and a Bolshevik down to 1922, has already contributed a powerful share with his book 'The Real Soviet Russia' (noticed in the 'Quarterly,' October 1947). Now he and his collaborator, Mr Boris I. Nicolaevsky, have published an authoritative work, '**Forced Labour in Soviet Russia**' (Hollis and Carter), dealing exclusively with the history, organisation, and results of the Soviet forced labour system. Such a system was not totally unknown in Imperial Russia. In 1906 there were 5,790 convicts employed on public work such as roadbuilding; in 1914 the figure had risen to 29,352. These, it must be noted, were convicted men: convicted in some, perhaps in many cases, of political offences, but still convicted by a regularly constituted court of justice. Now there are millions. Maybe ten million, maybe fifteen. No one, even in Soviet Russia, can know the exact tally of this gigantic slave class, torn from home, family, native country without trial and on the barest pretext, to bolster up Soviet economic policy. Mr Dallin gives one case,



officially quoted, of a woman deported for failing to salt the dinner where she was employed: pretext, under Par. III of the Soviet penal code, 'failure to perform official duties.' No slavery, strictly speaking, was ever accompanied by such appalling conditions, not even those in the Stone House of the Khalifa at Khartoum. To find a parallel, one must go to Auschwitz and Ravensbrück, where the mortality was hardly greater than among the Soviet labour slaves on the Solovetsk Islands. Perhaps the most horrifying passage in Mr Dallin's 'Forced Labour' is that detailing (pp. 270-74) the instructions to a detachment rounding up fresh slaves. One such drive, a merely regional affair, netted 60,000. But there were far more fruitful expeditions. Between two and three million Tartars from the Crimea were carried off at one swoop. Messrs Dallin and Nicolaevsky have used a mass of unimpeachable evidence in their researches: often official Soviet reports, for the rest those of independent witnesses. Outside the literature of direct torture, their book is one of the most painful ever to be written. Without the testimony presented by it, a man might hardly credit the existence of such barbarous degradation imposed on humanity on so vast a scale by a handful of completely callous tyrants as the Soviet regime avows and justifies, e.g. Mr Molotov, on March 8, 1931, at the Sixth Congress of Soviets. It is also one of the most useful books to be written, not only as material for the future historian, but as a lesson to ourselves in the present.

There have been many books on Brighton, mostly giving prominence to the glamorous, showy and often tawdry period of George IV as Prince of Wales, Regent, and King. Mr Anthony Dale in his 'Fashionable Brighton, 1820-1860' (Country Life) takes a different line and indeed, except in casual references, the Pavilion, the Steine and neighbouring parts of the older Brighton are ignored and prominence is given to the development of the newer Brighton in Kemp Town to the east and to 'Brunswick Town' to the west, and the squares, crescents, and terraces on the borders of Hove. Mr Dale fully proves his case that the general popularity of the town, instead of decreasing, increased by leaps and bounds after 1820, and indeed the list of famous residents and visitors and the doings of Society make a glittering parade, very well worth recording.

But the chief value of the book, and it is great, is perhaps architectural, and the mass of information given about the building of the houses, churches, hotels, and places of recreation and the planning and laying out of the squares and gardens make impressive as well as interesting reading. Brighton owes much to the Wilds, Busbys, Kemps, Cubitts, and their contemporary architects, builders, and decorators. The work is adorned and greatly aided by nearly a hundred excellent illustrations, but there is one glaring deficiency in that there is no map. Without that it is difficult for the reader often to locate exactly where the buildings are and what is the general plan.

Mr J. A. K. Thomson, who has to his credit three books on the Greek tradition, has had the useful idea of writing a popular study entitled '**The Classical Background of English Literature**' (George Allen and Unwin). His approach is simple, not to say elementary, which is perhaps just as well seeing that few people under fifty know anything at all about the Greek or Latin classics in their native dress. To all such readers Mr Thomson proffers in simple, attractive English a clear and reasonably comprehensive account of how, when, and where the great classical writers directly or indirectly entered English literature and how they have influenced and shaped it. Moreover, as is essential to readers who have little Latin and less Greek he makes plain the connections between Latin writers and their Greek masters, and how both Greek and Latin influences have spread and rooted themselves throughout Western Europe. It is possible that because those influences have never been potent in Eastern Europe and Russia that an unbridgeable chasm divides them and us. The eighteenth century saw the high tide of Classical influences in this country. In the nineteenth century, although beginning to decline, those influences were still potent and Mr Thomson traces their effects in such writers as Wordsworth, Coleridge, Scott, Landor, Byron, Keats, Browning, Pater and, in particular, in Arnold, Newman, and Tennyson. The debt we owe to such writers as Matthew Arnold and Tennyson for transmitting to us in pellucid English immortal classical beauty is rightly emphasised. Keats, the author holds, only achieved Greek perfection and restraint in the 'Ode to a Grecian Urn' and Tennyson in 'Ulysses' takes us direct into the Homeric world.

Perhaps the severity and restraint of the pure Attic style never has, and never will, appeal to us as much as does the Corinthian. Through Milton we have inherited the Latin 'grand style,' and although Newman is obviously influenced by the Greek New Testament, it is difficult to believe that Ruskin, Pater, or Rossetti knew a word of Greek.

For better or for worse the classical influences on the English language have faded—perhaps never to return. A knowledge of, and reverence for, the classics is too obvious a sign of inequality to be welcome to the untrained and unrestrained minds of contemporary democracy which does not even know that its pet label comes from Greece, and that it was the Greeks who first insisted that every free-born boy should be taught reading, writing, and arithmetic.

It is pleasing for an Etonian reviewer to write about and pay a tribute to the sister, and rival, school of Harrow, always provided that it is not at the time of 'Lords' when rooted prejudice is permitted to flourish without shame! 'Harrow School, Yesterday and To-day,' by Dr E. D. Laborde (Winchester Publications), 'is a faithful and scrupulous guide to the buildings, Houses, and institutions of the School, their history, their *arcana*, their embellishments and treasures, and the legends that cling to them. . . . Also it is a handbook of traditional and contemporary customs.' Thus writes the present Headmaster, and readers will certainly agree that the book fulfils its purpose admirably. It is a storehouse of information, at times in its amplitude somewhat bewildering to those who do not know the place well. Dr Laborde, after a brief survey of the Hill and its surroundings in ancient days, tells of the Lyon foundation at the beginning of the seventeenth century, when doubtless the teaching was good, though there were no half- or whole-holidays, while the only recreations were spinning tops and tossing handballs. Thence through the centuries we are told of the development, ups and downs, triumphs, and trials of the School, of famous headmasters such as Wordsworth, Butler, and Vaughan, Welldon, Wood, and Norwood, and of many famous old boys, including Byron, Peel, Palmerston, Shaftesbury, and more recently Winston Churchill and Alexander. Perhaps Dr Wood deserves special grateful mention for his noble

efforts to secure land round the school as a protection against the ever-flowing tide of suburban London's bricks and mortar, which has so sadly spoilt most of the former country round. Fifty excellent photographic illustrations and ten diagrams and maps adorn the volume.

Mr Francis W. Hirst, the well-known author and former editor of 'The Economist,' has under the title of '**In the Golden Days**' (Frederick Muller) written the first instalment of his reminiscences, covering the years up to 1908. Some readers may think that they are given full measure of the Hirst family and its Yorkshire setting, but that is an excusable indulgence on the part of an autobiographer. After being at school at Clifton, of which Mr Hirst gives a good account, he proceeded to Wadham College, Oxford, where he was the contemporary and friend of F. E. Smith, afterwards Lord Birkenhead, and of J. A. Simon, the present Lord Simon. His distinguished Oxford career included a double first in the Schools and the presidency of the Union, where he showed strongly the Liberalism in politics of which he has always been a doughty champion. Like 'F. E.' and Simon he was called to the bar, but unlike them did not find profitable livelihood in it and so took to literature and journalism. For many months he 'devilled' for Lord Morley in arranging and preparing material for the '**Life of Gladstone**,' and the chapters in this book dealing with his time at Hawarden and his many discussions with Morley and his friends are of very real interest. In the Boer War Mr Hirst was among the so-called '**Little Englanders**,' following Morley and Campbell-Bannerman and keenly opposed to the war. A chapter on the revival and triumph of Liberalism under 'C. B.' rounds off suitably and with historical interest and clarity the reminiscences of a political writer and thinker with whose views and opinions the '**Quarterly**' has but little agreement, but to whose honesty and high purpose it pays tribute.

Sir James Marchant, as editor, has collected a remarkable team of contributors to his book '**What Life has Taught Me**' (Odhams). Certainly eminent men such as Dr Inge, Bertrand Russell, Lord Horder, E. V. Knox, L. P. Jacks, Lord Lytton, Lord Ashfield, Frank Salisbury, Lord Chesterfield, Father Martindale, Sir Seymour Hicks, Sir William Darling, Lord Templewood, and Lord Jowitt—

to mention some of the team—can be trusted to view life and its lessons from many different angles. On the whole they have skilfully avoided what Lord Jowitt calls the almost irresistible temptation to indulge in a few respectable platitudes, when called on to write on such a subject. One writer complains that he has been insufficiently briefed as to the lines on which he was expected to write—how much factual autobiography, how much reflection on lessons learned from experience, and how much philosophical speculation on life. Some articles contain all these ingredients well mingled, and good examples are those of the late Lord Lytton and Dr Inge. Others are given to too much generalisation, but taken as a whole the collection is illuminating, sincere, and instructive.

A work of reference like a 'Who's Who' is really impossible to review, though it can well be recommended when its usefulness is so apparent and has been so well tested in past years as 'The International Who's Who,' 12th edition, 1948 (Europa Publications, Ltd.). The whole volume has been brought up to date with a large number of new names added and it well fulfils its purpose of supplying a concise, accurate, and as far as possible comprehensive guide to the most eminent living personalities in many countries. However baldly factual the information given must be for reasons of space, there is a fascination in opening a volume like this anywhere and finding oneself transported to U.S.A., Canada, Argentina, France, Germany, Italy, Russia, Greece, the Middle East, India, South Africa, Australia, and a score of other countries. Here are over a thousand pages with perhaps an average of twelve entries each. They make one realise that there must be an immense number of people who by real merit or by courtesy are classed as 'eminent.' This work should be very popular in all places where works of reference are required.

Canon Spencer Leeson, formerly Head Master of Winchester, naturally writes with great authority and wide experience on the subject of education, and therefore his book 'The Public Schools Question' (Longmans) will command attention. He begins with a useful explanation of the various technical terms used—often confusing because the same words have been used with different associations at different times by officials—aided, controlled or maintained, independent, grammar, secondary, provided

or council schools and so forth. The author then gives his views on the present position and future prospects of the independent schools, including the great public schools. He shows convincingly what a useful purpose they serve and how unfortunate it would be if those who want everything standardised to the same pattern and state controlled got their way. Afterwards Canon Leeson deals with the Education Act of 1944 and the Grammar Schools, classics and history in sixth-form teaching, and also the teaching of Christianity in schools. He has some trenchant words to say about the present overwhelming influence of written examinations and their sometimes useful but often pernicious results. His comments on and suggestions for school life and teaching are both valuable and thought provoking.

'Georgian Edinburgh,' by Ian G. Lindsay (Oliver and Boyd), is an attractive book of rather over fifty pages with twenty-four finely reproduced photographic plates. It deals concisely with the planning and actual development of the City between 1714 and 1830, the all-important period during which the compression within the 138 acres of the old city inside its historic walls ended and houses and streets came into existence both north and south. Edinburgh is an outstanding example of town planning on a large scale, mostly carried out with an admirable sense of dignity and appropriate artistic style, though alas much has been spoilt by later commercialism. As the author says, 'Princes Street has a fine view but hardly a decent building.' We are given a good general survey of the Georgian development and then specialised notes on the architects, the churches, the public buildings and streets and houses. Lovers of Edinburgh should certainly have this book on their shelves.

# World News by Magazine

This has been our business for over eighty years and we feel competent to give you the service which you desire.

We are the largest and most reliable agency for prompt delivery of Foreign and Domestic Periodicals in this Country.

We carry the latest English, Irish and German Publications in stock.

**LIBRARIES:—ORDERS FOR ENGLISH BOOKS** receive prompt attention to insure fast service through our **LIBRARY ORDER DEPARTMENT**, which has been opened to fill your special needs.

**Our subscription** prices include postage to all parts of the United States, Cuba, Mexico, Porto Rico.

Our **BACK NUMBER DEPT.** can furnish quick service in supplying you with old issues.

For quick and efficient service send your orders for Foreign Publications to

**THE INTERNATIONAL NEWS COMPANY**

Division of **THE AMERICAN NEWS COMPANY, INC.**

131 Varick Street, New York City

*Send for Price Lists*



# SWELL BLOWN CONJUGAL

THEY WERE BOTH OF THEM  
IN THE MIDDLE OF THE

THEY WERE BOTH OF THEM  
IN THE MIDDLE OF THE

THEY WERE BOTH OF THEM  
IN THE MIDDLE OF THE

THEY WERE BOTH OF THEM  
IN THE MIDDLE OF THE

THEY WERE BOTH OF THEM  
IN THE MIDDLE OF THE

THEY WERE BOTH OF THEM  
IN THE MIDDLE OF THE

THEY WERE BOTH OF THEM  
IN THE MIDDLE OF THE

THEY WERE BOTH OF THEM  
IN THE MIDDLE OF THE

THEY WERE BOTH OF THEM  
IN THE MIDDLE OF THE

THEY WERE BOTH OF THEM  
IN THE MIDDLE OF THE

